3

Kirstein Business

694k

2nd Floor

New Markets:

The Untapped Retail Buying Power In America's Inner Cities

Andrew Cuomo, Secretary

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

hud

July 1999

KIRSTEIN BUSINESS BRANCH

latest available Jan 2003

NEW MARKETS:

The Untapped Retail Buying Power In America's Inner Cities

July 1999

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Mail Stop: SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-9328
ISBN 0-16-050105-9

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

"Our greatest untapped markets are not overseas—they are right here at home. And we should go after them."

President Bill Clinton
State of the Union Address, 1999

There is enormous economic potential in America's low-income communities, both urban and rural. This report focuses principally on the strong growth potential in many inner-city neighborhoods that are underserved by retail stores. Alongside the underappreciated business advantages of these communities—such as significant and concentrated spending power, an available and trainable labor pool, location advantages, and underutilized, developable land and buildings—there are barriers to business development in these new markets. Among the most important is the "capital gap"—the lack of access to capital and technical expertise. Helping to close this capital gap is the hallmark of the President's proposed **New Markets Initiative** for inner cities and distressed rural areas. Another key barrier is the need for better market information. This report helps close the information gap, focusing on a key dimension of the urban new markets—the untapped retail potential of many of America's low- and moderate-income inner-city neighborhoods.

Despite the huge retail purchasing power of their residents, many of the Nation's inner-city neighborhoods suffer from significant "out-shopping"—they have too little retail to meet the demand, and tap the buying power, of their own residents. While many urbanites both live and work in the city, much of their income is spent elsewhere—in the suburbs, on-line, or on mail order—and suburbanites could spend more in the city. Even more so than the larger urban market, though, it is America's inner-city neighborhoods that are undiscovered territories for many businesses.

This study, part of an ongoing series in which the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) reports to the Nation on the state of its cities and metropolitan regions, focuses on retail buying power and sales patterns in the 539 U.S. central cities—the principal cities of our larger metropolitan areas—and specifically on the low-income inner-city neighborhoods within those central cities. It highlights the enormous potential waiting to be tapped in economically distressed communities. The Department will also be releasing in the coming months a report on the market potential of rural America—places such as Appalachia, the Mississippi Delta, Indian Country, and towns and counties across the Nation. This is part of a larger effort. At the President's request, a number of Federal agencies will be focusing new attention on new markets in the coming months, improving the information, capital, and other tools that businesses and communities need.

Thanks to the strong fiscal policies and community empowerment agenda of President Clinton and Vice President Gore, the Nation is enjoying the longest peacetime economic expansion in its history. Unemployment and crime are down, the Federal

budget is in surplus, the stock market is hitting record highs, low interest rates are fueling a boom in business growth, homeownership is at an all-time high, and American entrepreneurs are remaking the face of global business.

HUD reported earlier this year in *Now Is the Time: Places Left Behind in the New Economy* and again in the 1999 *State of the Cities* report that, thanks to a booming national economy, most cities are experiencing a strong fiscal and economic recovery, with trends that parallel the Nation's—unemployment and crime down, homeownership up, and a new vitality evident from downtown to the neighborhoods.

However, too many cities are still left behind, especially some of the Nation's small- and mid-sized cities. They continue to face the challenges of population decline, loss of middle-class families, slow job growth, income inequality, and poverty. Serious population losses plague about 1 in 5 of the Nation's central cities (116 central cities in 28 States). Unemployment remains unacceptably high—50 percent or more above the national average—in 1 in 6 (95 central cities in 26 States). And stubborn poverty persists in 1 in 3 of our central cities, with poverty rates of 20 percent or more in 170 central cities in 34 States. Even in cities that look healthy in the aggregate, there are deep pockets of distress-areas with concentrated joblessness and poverty, along with the lack of hope that accompany those symptoms of distress. These are the low- and moderate-income neighborhoods that America has come to call "the inner city."

As the President has said, now is the time to lift up these places left behind—to bring today's prosperity to all corners of the Nation. This is not an act of charity but of smart business—for, as this report documents for the retail sector, there is huge, untapped market potential in inner-city neighborhoods. If America is to sustain its strong economy, we must tap new markets, drawing on unmet consumer demand, harnessing underutilized labor, and investing in developable urban land. There is a simple reality: the economy needs new room to grow—new markets where business capital can be invested to generate significant returns and produce jobs and lasting community benefits.

> *"The best way to reverse decades of decline in America's cities is to attract new businesses and new jobs to bring people and prosperity to every corner of this Nation."*
>
> **Vice President Al Gore**

Working with Congress, the Clinton-Gore Administration has made a major commitment to America's underserved communities and untapped markets over the past 6 years, with **Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities,** a strengthened **Community Reinvestment Act,** the **Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund,** expanded **Affordable Housing Vouchers, 100,000 new community police officers, School Modernization Bonds, Youth Opportunity Areas, Welfare to Work** grants, an expanded **Earned Income Tax Credit,** the **Economic Development Initiative,** and the **Brownfields Economic Development Initiative,** to name but a few. But now is the time to do more.

In an effort to seize this unique moment in our history and to build on the empowerment sucesses of the past 6 years, this month marks an historic trade

mission by President Clinton—a domestic trade mission to America's most important untapped markets: those in our inner cities and distressed rural communities. It is a mission to highlight the innovative toolbox known as the **New Markets Initiative,** as well as other important empowerment proposals in the Administration's FY 2000 budget, to connect Wall Street to Main Street and join the great engine of American capital and entrepreneurship to the places where people are ready to work but not yet employed, ready to buy but not yet served adequately by businesses.

The scale of these new markets is highlighted in the main findings of this report. These findings are set in the context of the larger markets of central cities but focus specifically on the tremendous untapped potential in many inner-city neighborhoods—the urban new markets:

As we can see, the shortage of retail stores in inner-city neighborhoods reflects a broader under-retailing of many central cities. For example, in New York City last year, the difference between households' retail buying power and total retail sales—the retail gap—was $37.1 billion, or almost one-third (31.2 percent) of total retail purchasing power, notwithstanding the world-famous shopping districts of the Big Apple. The retail gap was $5.4 billion in Los Angeles (10.5 percent); $9.8 billion in Chicago (25.9 percent); $1.4 billion in Detroit (17.9 percent); $3.9 billion in San Jose (25.1 percent); and $2.8 billion in Washington, D.C. (28.4 percent), with many smaller communities also showing significant retail gaps.[1] (Other cities—higher-income communities such as Stamford, Connecticut and Palo Alto, California—have a retail gap, too, as shown in Table 3, but this reflects differences in savings and a much wider array of

FINDING #1

America's inner-city neighborhoods possess enormous retail purchasing power-estimated at $331 billion last year, or one-third of the $1.1 trillion total for the central cities in which those neighborhoods are located. At the city level, the greatest retail purchasing power is, not surprisingly, in the largest central cities—New York at $118.7 billion in 1998; Los Angeles at $51.7 billion; and Chicago at $38 billion—where mom-and-pop stores in the neighborhood coexist with posh shopping districts. (See Table 1.) The tremendous retail purchasing power of major cities is to be expected, given their concentrated wealth. However, many small- and mid-sized cities reveal surprisingly large-scale buying potential, too—for example Trenton, New Jersey at $880 million; Galveston, Texas at $684.5 million; Charleston, South Carolina at $1 billion; Schenectady, New York at $700.9 million; and Davis, California at $893.4 million. ***But far more striking are the urban new markets. Considering only the "inner-city neighborhoods"—those with higher poverty and lower incomes than the cities that surround them—the retail market remains huge.*** For example, New Haven, Connecticut's inner-city neighborhoods alone possess $1 billion per year in retail buying power; Allentown, Pennsylvania's $307.9 million; Gary, Indiana's $753.8 million; and East St. Louis, Illinois' $226.7 million. (See Table 2.)

FINDING #2

Despite their huge buying power, many of America's inner-city communities are "under-retailed," with sales that fall significantly short of residents' retail purchasing power. The total shortfall was $8.7 billion last year for the 48 inner-city areas in which HUD found a retail gap. (See Table 2.) Many inner-city areas, not listed in this study, do not show such a gap—and even have a surplus—by HUD's conservative estimates, but those areas could nonetheless benefit from increased private investment. In 1998, retail sales in the economically distressed, inner-city neighborhoods of Chicago alone fell $2.3 billion short of the retail buying power of residents in those communities. Such retail gaps are found nationwide in the inner-city areas of many small, mid-sized, and large cities alike, reflecting both untapped potential for businesses and a shortage of retail jobs and quality shopping for residents. Last year, the inner-city neighborhoods in Washington, D.C. had an aggregate retail gap of over $379 million; in Watts, $445.5 million; in Detroit, $441 million; in Newark, $658 million; and in East St. Louis, Illinois, $49.6 million (21.9 percent of total purchasing power in that small and highly distressed community).

spending options that most urbanites do not have.) Table 1, the list of central cities with *measurable* retail gaps, actually understates the untapped retail market in urban areas: according to economists, most cities should be "destination retail" hubs for suburbanites, tourists, and others, with retail sales that *exceed* the buying power of the cities' own residents.

Aside from the untapped retail demand, urban locations, particularly the inner-city neighborhoods targeted by the President's New Markets Initiative, typically offer a critical advantage for retailers—***density of demand.*** The higher population density of most inner-city neighborhoods more than balances out the higher average household incomes in spread-out suburban areas. For example, Harlem's estimated retail demand for food and apparel of $116 million per square mile per year is more than twice the New York metro area rate of $53 million; retail demand per square mile in inner-city Boston is six times as great as in the Boston metro area as a whole. Not surprisingly, the Super Stop and Shop store in Boston's inner city is the highest grossing of that company's 186 supermarkets.[2]

In other communities, retail sales in new markets as a whole match or even exceed estimated retail buying power, but key low-income pockets are under-retailed and otherwise underserved by businesses. For example, while Phoenix as a whole has a strong economy and low unemployment rate, the area's rapid growth has created pockets of distress—South Phoenix has much higher poverty and joblessness than the region as a whole. And while the South Phoenix Enterprise Community has strong retail sales, there remain pockets of retail opportunity that local businesses are just beginning to tap, with help from flexible government incentives and the savvy of grassroots nonprofit organizations.

While the under-retailing of new markets is clear, there remains a significant ***information gap*** inhibiting inner-city business development, including retail expansion. As suggested above, traditional sources of business data are often ill-suited to measure the special features of the urban marketplace. For example, much of the cash economy in cities goes unrecorded, and averages—median income, say—often mask pockets of affluence that coexist with pockets of poverty. Rich databases and models that are designed specifically for urban markets are just now appearing.[4]

> *"Increased business investment can transform many inner cities from places left behind by the new economy into places leading the way to economic success—bringing shoppers, billions of dollars in consumer spending, and new jobs to urban America."*
>
> **HUD Secretary Andrew Cuomo**

In spite of the information gap, the clear profit potential is attracting a handful of major retailers to tap the gold mine of urban markets, often in the inner city. Sears, Roebuck & Company has dramatically expanded its urban presence in the last few years. With annual sales of $75 million to $100 million each, these center city stores are grossing triple the company average.[5] Kmart's SuperK store in Oakland, California reports sales 50 percent higher than for comparable stores in the chain, and the Foot Locker outlet in Harlem has sales exceeding $1,000 per square foot.[6] Some of the biggest winners are grocery stores. The "star stores" for Pathmark and Super Stop and Shop, two leading chains in the Northeast, are in the inner city.[7] About one-half of Pathmark stores are located in low-income communities.

Pools of untapped labor will give new businesses a competitive edge. The central cities have much higher rates of workers seeking employment than the suburbs, and the rate is higher still in the low-income inner-city neighborhoods within central cities. Last year, in the central cities alone, there were over 2 million Americans looking for work. Another 2 million are not in permanent jobs or have stopped looking for work because problems with child care, transportation, or skill levels prevent them from taking a job. For example, Watts in Los Angeles is home to an untapped labor force of nearly 12,000. Finally, with fewer businesses in these untapped markets, wages, and therefore labor costs for businesses, are competitive as well.

Despite the clear market potential, and the striking example of a handful of retailers "pioneering" their way back into cities and reaping major profits in the process, there is this stark reality: city residents, particularly those in low-income inner-city neighborhoods, are out-shopping to the tune of many billions of dollars each year. Given their economic distress, it is inner-city neighborhoods, more than other parts of America's cities, that need to capture more of their residents' huge retail purchasing power. There is a gold mine that these communities, and the businesses that partner with them, can tap in a virtuous cycle.

NEW MARKETS IN RURAL AMERICA: A PREVIEW

The rich, untapped market potential that awaits in America's new markets is not limited to the inner cities. There are new markets in rural America as well, including communities that have been mired in high poverty and joblessness for decades—in Appalachia, the Mississippi Delta, Indian Country, and the borderland Colonias, for example. The record-breaking economy presents the Nation with the opportunity to include these and other rural places in the promise of growth and prosperity.

Except for agriculture, timber, and certain extractive industries, such as mining, rural communities have often been more isolated from the investment capital that cities attract. The labor force, like the population generally, is more dispersed. Rural regions often present a less diversified economic base—at least initially—than metropolitan areas. And infrastructure is more modest in some areas, especially key regions in Indian Country and the Colonias. Still, rural America has shown countless strengths amidst hard times, with innovative small town governments, committed businesses, community foundations, local nonprofits, faith-based institutions, and other groups taking the lead and with entrepreneurial State and Federal agencies acting as vital partners.

Although rural and urban economies differ in important ways, one thing is clear: major untapped markets exist in rural America as they do in the cities. In fact, thanks to the information revolution and other economic trends, businesses are increasingly mobile. A wider array of businesses can reach their customers from strategic rural locations that offer competitive advantages, such as inexpensive land, lower average labor costs, and more. These highlights of a forthcoming HUD report begin to illustrate the potential:

- ***The Pine Ridge reservation, home to the Oglala Sioux tribe, is the poorest county in the Nation, but even in Pine Ridge, there is $60 million in retail buying power each year.*** The poverty rate in Pine Ridge was almost 63 percent at the most recent census, and 42 percent of adults never graduated from high school. Yet this small population of approximately 11,000 has $60 million to spend on retail needs somewhere. Most of that amount is spent off the reservation because there is so little commercial activity within Pine Ridge—an especially common pattern in Indian Country.
- ***The counties that make up the Mississippi Delta have $95.7 billion in retail purchasing power.*** Poverty in the Delta was almost 21 percent in 1995, and more than one-third (34.1 percent) of adults never graduated from high school. Yet there is significant buying potential—and potential for innovative, higher quality businesses even in communities where stores are meeting most of the area's demand.
- ***The counties that make up the Kentucky Highlands in Appalachia have over $1.3 billion in retail purchasing power.*** Poverty in 1995 was 33.5 percent in the Highlands, and

over one-half (54 percent) of adults never graduated from high school. Yet smart finance and partnership building are beginning to mine the untapped buying power, trainable labor force, and more.

Creative businesses, often partnering with smart governments and nonprofit groups, are making profits and growing the job base in these and other rural communities. For example, with financing from the Kentucky Highlands Investment Corporation, a nationally known community development organization, Mid-South Electrics in Jackson County, Kentucky expanded a small operation to employ 850 persons. Mid-South will add a $6 million, 100- to 150-employee expansion this year. Its sales grew 30 percent in the last year alone.

And HUD is working on Pine Ridge to overcome the special barriers to homeownership that many tribes face. HUD has created Shared Visions, a model partnership involving the tribe, the Federal Government, and leading private lenders eager to tap this market. On Pine Ridge and in most low-income communities, housing is often the first step toward broader economic development, since better housing creates retail demand, more stable families able to consume and invest, and construction and other skills that develop the workforce. These are but a few of the businesses—and committed business partners—making it work in America's rural new markets.

CONCLUSION

The huge untapped demand for retail goods in new markets means that many of our Nation's retailers are missing major profit-making opportunities. At the same time, the fact that inner-city residents must do so much of their retail shopping outside of their communities means that the full benefits of our economic expansion have not yet extended to urban new markets—bringing jobs, quality shopping, and a stronger tax base to all communities, especially those that face economic distress.

On the retail front, the challenge ahead is to create a "virtuous cycle of retail" in our Nation's inner-city areas—to promote business growth, jobs, and savings in all of America's communities. The goal is not to generate a consumption binge by those who most need to build more assets and get ahead, nor is it to divert buying power away from the hardworking businesspeople outside of cities. The goal is net gain, and the virtuous cycle is achievable: businesses move into inner-city neighborhoods, hiring local residents and raising their incomes. This higher income allows residents to both save and spend more, and the higher demand allows city businesses—including those in the inner-city neighborhoods themselves—to be more profitable and do more hiring. More hiring raises income and consumer demand. The cycle feeds itself, creating sustainable economic development and allowing low-income communities to have more assets, a strong tax base, more quality shopping, and more jobs.

The President and Vice President have proposed an expanded agenda to seize the unprecedented opportunity that our economic expansion offers, asking Congress to enact new tools to ensure business growth and community empowerment in the new century. The multi-agency **New Markets Initiative (NMI)** will build a new national network of private investment institutions to provide the capital and expertise needed to flourish in inner cities and

distressed rural communities by the full continuum of businesses—from the largest companies to microenterprises. NMI includes seven programs that emphasize equity capital needs in new markets. **America's Private Investment Companies (APIC),** jointly administered by HUD and the Small Business Administration, will create private investment companies to invest in large businesses seeking to expand or locate in low-income communities—investments are expected to total $1.5 billion. **Small Business Investment Companies (SBICs) Targeted to New Markets** will invest between $100,000 and $1 million (per financing) in small businesses, while **New Market Venture Capital Companies** will provide additional venture capital and technical assistance for start-ups. Expanded support for **Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFIs)** will provide a range of financial products and services directly to small businesses and individuals. Microenterprises will receive additional loans and technical assistance. A **New Markets Tax Credit** will help spur $6 billion in private equity investment in low- and moderate-income communities, providing the extra fuel needed for businesses of all sizes to invest and grow. And **BusinessLINC,** which stands for Learning, Information, Networking, and Collaboration, will encourage mentoring relationships between large and small firms.

The private sector will provide the time, energy, and creativity needed for successful investment in low- and moderate-income areas, while entrepreneurial and forward-looking governments help create the needed institutional framework. For example, the **Community Empowerment Fund (CEF)** will streamline two existing HUD programs (grants and loan guarantees) to create jobs in new markets, emphasizing **Welfare to Work Targeted Job Creation** and vital **City-Suburb Business Connections** that connect inner cities to regional economic growth. An innovative pilot, the **CEF Trust**, will standardize underwriting and create loan pools to enable a secondary market for economic development loans. (For details on the Administration's agenda, see Part Two of HUD's 1999 *State of the Cities* report).

The new and enhanced initiatives mentioned above—all designed to stimulate investment in untapped markets—will be joined to existing programs with a proven track record in building communities. And a reinvigorated, reinvented HUD is an active, effective community partner nationwide.

Beyond the capital and opportunity gaps addressed by NMI and other initiatives, a significant barrier to major new private investment in underserved urban neighborhoods is the above-mentioned ***information gap*** that understates true market potential in most cities—and in low-income inner-city neighborhoods most of all. This report helps to close that gap, but much work lies ahead.

The opportunities highlighted in this report are significant for inner-city neighborhoods and for America. Pent-up, unmet demand—and the density of that demand—in new urban markets presents us with a chance to further two of our most important goals as a Nation: first, to extend the record-breaking economic expansion by identifying new profit opportunities and room for growth; and second, to extend the fruits of that expansion to all Americans, especially those who have yet to be lifted fully in the Nation's extraordinary rising tide.

CONTENTS

Executive Summary iii
New Markets in Rural America: A Preview viii
Introduction: The Untapped Consumer Markets in Inner-City Neighborhoods 1
The New Evidence: Retail Buying Power and the Retail Gap 5
The Payoff 9
An Information Gap Inhibits Inner-City Retail Growth 11
Closing the Information Gap 13
New Markets in Rural America: A Preview 15
Conclusion 17
Appendix: Technical Notes on Tables and Analysis 19

"Why do we open stores in the city? Because that's where the people are."

Harvey Gutman, senior Vice President for Retail Development of Pathmark, a large northeastern supermarket chain.[8]

INTRODUCTION: THE UNTAPPED CONSUMER MARKETS IN INNER-CITY NEIGHBORHOODS

There is enormous economic potential in America's low-income communities, both urban and rural. This report focuses principally on the strong growth potential in many inner-city neighborhoods that are underserved by retail stores. Alongside the underappreciated business advantages of these communities—such as significant and concentrated spending power, an available and trainable labor pool, location advantages, and underutilized, developable land and buildings—there are barriers to business development in these new markets. Among the most important is the "capital gap"—the lack of access to capital (especially equity capital) and technical expertise. Helping to close this capital gap is the hallmark of the President's proposed New Markets Initiative for inner cities and distressed rural areas. Another key barrier is the need for better market information. This report helps close the information gap, focusing on a key dimension of the urban new markets—the untapped retail potential of many of America's low- and moderate-income inner-city neighborhoods.

Despite the huge retail purchasing power of their residents, many of the Nation's inner-city neighborhoods suffer from significant "out-shopping"—they have too little retail to meet the demand, and tap the buying power, of their own residents. While many urbanites both live and work in the city, much of their income is spent elsewhere—in the suburbs, on-line, or on mail order—and suburbanites could spend more in the city. Even more so than the larger urban market, though, it is America's inner-city neighborhoods that are undiscovered territories for many businesses.

This study, part of an ongoing series in which the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) reports to the Nation on the state of its cities and metropolitan regions, focuses on retail buying power and sales patterns in the 539 U.S. central cities—the principal cities of our larger metropolitan areas—and the low-income inner-city neighborhoods within those central cities. The study highlights the enormous potential waiting to be tapped in economically distressed communities and the larger urban retail markets in which inner-city neighborhoods are situated. The Department will also be releasing in the coming months a report on the market potential of rural America—places such as Appalachia, the Mississippi Delta, Indian Country, and towns and counties across the Nation. This is part of a larger effort. At the President's

request, a number of Federal agencies will be focusing new attention on new markets in the coming months, improving the information, capital, and other tools that businesses and communities need.

The Nation's Successes—and the Work Ahead

Thanks to the strong fiscal policies and community empowerment agenda of President Clinton and Vice President Gore, the Nation is enjoying the longest peacetime economic expansion in its history. Unemployment and crime are down, the Federal budget is in surplus, the stock market is hitting record highs, low interest rates are fueling a boom in business growth, homeownership is at an all-time high, and American entrepreneurs are remaking the face of global business.

HUD reported earlier this year in *Now Is the Time: Places Left Behind in the New Economy* and again in the 1999 *State of the Cities* report that, thanks to a booming national economy, most cities are experiencing a strong fiscal and economic recovery, with trends that parallel the Nation's—unemployment and crime down, homeownership up, and a new vitality evident from downtown to the neighborhoods.

However, too many cities are still left behind and continue to face the challenges of population decline, loss of middle-class families, slow job growth, income inequality, and poverty. Serious population losses plague about 1 in 5 of the Nation's central cities (116 central cities in 28 States). Unemployment remains unacceptably high—50 percent or more above the national average—in 1 in 6 (95 central cities in 26 States). And stubborn poverty persists in 1 in 3 of our central cities, with poverty rates of 20 percent or more in 170 central cities in 34 States. Even in cities that look healthy in the aggregate, there are deep pockets of distress—areas with concentrated joblessness and poverty, along with the lack of hope that accompany those symptoms of distress. These are the low- and moderate-income neighborhoods that America has come to call "the inner city."

As the President has said, now is the time to lift up these places left behind—to bring the great new prosperity to all corners of the Nation. This is not an act of charity but of smart business—for, as this report documents for the retail sector, there is huge, untapped market potential throughout our cities, especially in low-income inner-city neighborhoods. If America is to sustain its strong economy, we must tap new markets, drawing on unmet consumer demand, harnessing underutilized labor, and investing in developable urban land. There is a simple reality: the economy needs new room to grow—new markets where business capital can be invested to generate significant returns and produce jobs and lasting community benefits.

Highlighting New Markets—Including the Retail Gap In Cities

In an effort to seize this unique moment in our history, this month marks an historic trade mission by President Clinton—a domestic trade mission to America's most important untapped markets: those in our inner cities and distressed rural communities. It is a mission to highlight the innovative toolbox known as the **New Markets Initiative,** to connect Wall Street to Main Street and join the great engine of American capital and entrepreneurship to the places where people are ready to work but not yet employed, ready to buy but not yet served adequately by businesses.

Working with Congress, the Clinton-Gore Administration has made a major commitment to America's underserved communities and untapped markets over the past 6 years, with **Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities,** a strengthened **Community Reinvestment Act,** the **Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund,** expanded **Affordable Housing Vouchers, 100,000 new community police officers, School Modernization Bonds, Youth Opportunity Areas, Welfare to Work** grants, an expanded **Earned Income Tax Credit,** the **Economic Development Initiative,** and the **Brownfields Economic Development Initiative,** to name a few. But now is the time to do more.

On the retail front, the challenge ahead is to create a "virtuous cycle of retail" in our Nation's inner-city areas-to promote business growth, jobs, and savings in all of America's communities. The goal is not to generate a consumption binge by those who most need to build more assets and get ahead, nor is it to divert buying power away from the hardworking businesspeople outside of cities. The goal is net gain, and the virtuous cycle is achievable: businesses move into inner-city neighborhoods, hiring local residents and raising their incomes. This higher income allows residents to both save and spend more, and the higher demand allows city businesses—including those in the inner-city neighborhoods themselves—to be more profitable and do more hiring. More hiring raises income and consumer demand. The cycle feeds itself, creating sustainable economic development and allowing low-income communities to have more assets, more quality shopping, a stronger tax base, and more jobs.

What's New About the Urban Marketplace

Urban enthusiasts have been touting the cities' market potential for a decade or more. So what is new and different now? The cities themselves have changed and are now open for business. A new breed of market-minded mayors is at the helm. These entrepreneurial executives are working hard to transform their cities' red-tape bureaucracies into streamlined welcoming committees for new and expanded enterprises. Meanwhile, the cities are in better financial shape than they used to be.

In addition, the Nation's long economic expansion is finally being felt in even the most disadvantaged urban areas, and healthier fiscal climates and bond ratings mean bigger investments in the infrastructure that is so critical to a strong business climate. Furthermore, crime—historically one of the biggest deterrents to inner-city investment—is down dramatically. Public education, another barrier to urban revival, remains a major challenge in many cities, but the mayors are actively working to meet it. They are also forming break-the-mold workforce development partnerships among grassroots groups, institutions of higher education, industry representatives, and innovative public agencies.

Some pioneering retail chains and other large businesses are finding cities an attractive alternative to the emerging markets overseas. For one thing, America's cities are not overseas—they are right here, close to supply lines. They are not dependent on the state of the world economy or on the politics of particular countries. Cities are also the business answer to saturated suburban markets.

The Power of Retail—and the Untapped Inner-City Advantage

Wherever they live and whatever their income level, people need to purchase certain items: groceries, pharmaceuticals, clothes, furniture, and sundry other things. If there are no stores selling these things nearby—or if the close-in stores sell low-quality goods at high prices—most people, if they are able to do so, will go where the selections are wider and the bargains better. For years, that has meant the suburbs. The phenomenon is so common that it has several names, one of which is "out-shopping."

The Boston Consulting Group and the Initiative for a Competitive Inner City (ICIC), for example, estimated that the retail purchasing power in inner-city ZIP codes amounts to nearly 7 percent of total retail spending in the country. And a close look at six inner cities showed unmet retail demand—and thus, potential market opportunities—of 50 percent or more in some ZIP codes. "What has led to this dearth of retail supply? Retailers, chains, and independents alike have overlooked the promise of the inner-city markets," the study contended. "Some might consider it discrimination. We call it bad strategy."[9]

There is huge spending power in inner-city neighborhoods. A considerable portion of household income in these communities is not recorded in Census Bureau data, most of it part of the huge cash economy in cities.[10]

Furthermore, inner-city shoppers are attractive customers, according to survey research. "In short, they like to shop," concluded a study on apparel buying by Pricewaterhouse Coopers in partnership with ICIC. "They enjoy shopping for apparel more so than the average American primary household shopper." In addition, "the inner-city shopper is more brand conscious and more fashion conscious than the average apparel shopper," and thus more profitable for the retailer.

THE NEW EVIDENCE: RETAIL BUYING POWER AND THE RETAIL GAP

Despite the potential, and the striking example of a handful of major retailers "pioneering" their way back into cities, there is a stark reality: as a result of the decades-long suburban focus, many cities now face a large retail gap, failing to capture significant proportions of their own residents' buying power—not to mention the business of suburbanites and tourists that they could be getting. And the gap is especially significant for distressed communities that need to retain and build wealth. Many residents must travel to suburban locations, or shop by mail or other means, to buy the goods that they could purchase in the neighborhood or elsewhere in the city. Put differently, urban residents in many major cities are "out-shopping" to the tune of many billions of dollars each year, as highlighted below.

FINDING #1

America's inner-city neighborhoods possess enormous retail purchasing power-estimated at $331 billion last year, or one-third of the $1.1 trillion total for the central cities in which those neighborhoods are located. At the city level, the greatest retail purchasing power is, not surprisingly, in the largest central cities—New York at $118.7 billion in 1998; Los Angeles at $51.7 billion; and Chicago at $38 billion—where mom-and-pop stores in the neighborhood coexist with posh shopping districts. (See Table 1.) The tremendous retail purchasing power of major cities is to be expected, given their concentrated wealth. However, many small-and mid-sized cities reveal surprisingly large-scale buying potential, too—for example Trenton, New Jersey at $880 million; Galveston, Texas at $684.5 million; Charleston, South Carolina at $1 billion; Schenectady, New York at $700.9 million; and Davis, California at $893.4 million. ***But far more striking are the urban new markets. Considering only the "inner-city neighborhoods"—those with higher poverty and lower incomes than the cities that surround them—the retail market remains huge.*** For example, New Haven, Connecticut's inner-city neighborhoods alone possess $1 billion per year in retail buying power; Allentown, Pennsylvania's $307.9 million; Gary, Indiana's $753.8 million; and East St. Louis, Illinois' $226.7 million. (See Table 2.)

FINDING #2

Despite their huge buying power, many of America's inner-city communities are "under-retailed," with sales that fall significantly short of residents' retail purchasing power. The total shortfall was $8.7 billion last year for the 48 inner-city areas in which HUD found a retail gap. (See Table 2.) Many inner-city areas, not listed in this study, do not show such a gap—and even have a surplus—by HUD's conservative estimates, but those areas could nonetheless benefit from increased private investment. In 1998, retail sales in the economically distressed, inner-city neighborhoods of Chicago alone fell $2.3 billion short of the retail buying power of residents in those communities. Such retail gaps are found nationwide in the inner-city areas of many small, mid-sized, and large cities alike, reflecting both untapped potential for businesses and a shortage of retail jobs and quality shopping for residents. Last year, the inner-city neighborhoods in Washington, D.C. had an aggregate retail gap of over $379 million; in Watts, $445.5 million; in Detroit, $441 million; in Newark, $658 million; and in East St. Louis, Illinois, $49.6 million (21.9 percent of total purchasing power in that small and highly distressed community).

As we can see, the shortage of retail stores in inner-city neighborhoods reflects a broader under-retailing of many central cities, and out-shopping affects cities of all sizes in every part of the country. For example, in New York City last year, the difference between households' retail buying power and total retail sales—the retail gap—was $37.1 billion, or almost one-third (31.2 percent) of total retail purchasing power, notwithstanding the world-famous shopping districts of the Big Apple. The retail gap was $5.4 billion in Los Angeles (10.5 percent); $9.8 billion in Chicago (25.9 percent); $1.4 billion in Detroit (17.9 percent); $3.9 billion in San Jose (25.1 percent); and $2.8 billion in Washington, D.C. (28.4 percent), with many smaller communities also showing significant retail gaps.[12] (Other cities—higher-income communities such as Stamford, Connecticut and Palo Alto, California—have a retail gap, too, as indicated in Table 3, but this reflects differences in savings and a much wider array of spending options that most urbanites do not have.) Table 1, the list of central cities with measurable retail gaps, actually understates the untapped retail market in urban areas: according to economists, most cities should be "destination retail" hubs for suburbanites, tourists, and others, with retail sales that exceed the buying power of the cities' own residents.

Not included in Table 1 are more affluent cities—such as Palo Alto, California and Stamford, Connecticut—where residents tend to have very different savings and spending patterns, driven by a geographically broader array of retail options, including travel and consumption at a distance. (See Appendix for details.)

Untapped markets for retail are especially evident in the Nation's inner-city neighborhoods[13]—areas with significantly higher rates of poverty and lower incomes than their cities as a whole. (See Table 2.) For example, the total retail gap in Detroit, Michigan's inner-city new market neighborhoods was over $441 million last year, meaning that stores in inner-city Detroit captured almost one-half of a billion dollars less than their own residents spent—on retail.

The fact that a city, or an inner-city new market area within a given central city, does not appear in Tables 1 and 2 does not mean that the community in question cannot benefit from, or take advantage of, strategic economic development assistance. There are areas with high poverty, high unemployment, and other problems where retail sales exceed local retail purchasing power. But the residents of these areas are not yet fully incorporated into the Nation's economic prosperity. In these areas, retail sales may not be the lead engine for economic development. Nevertheless, with more economic development, they should expect increased retail demand.

The comparisons in Tables 1 and 2 between retail sales and retail purchasing power provide a broad indication of imbalances between the supply of and demand for retail goods and services. Specific business investment decisions would require more detailed data, including information on the type and location of retail outlets and the age, race, and household-type of residents. More specific decisions call for finer-grained information.

Understanding Buying Power

As noted above, these best available data on retail gaps nationwide may actually understate true retail potential in inner cities and other areas for several reasons. One is that economists believe that cities should be "destinations" for retail expenditure, even though suburban malls have supplanted many downtowns, or reduced their market share, in recent decades. Second, and perhaps more importantly, one-size-fits-all assumptions about how much households will spend on retail purchases probably understate actual retail expenditures and forecasts. The evidence is that the residents of urban new markets—low-income inner-city neighborhoods—typically spend a higher-than-average proportion of household income on household items, especially food and apparel.

According to special analyses of the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer Expenditure Survey commissioned by the Treasury Department, on average, residents of urban new markets earn just 54 percent of what other central city residents earn. But they spend 62 percent as much in total, 67 percent as much on clothing, and 89 percent as much for food at home.

Concentrated Buying Power—the Density of Demand in Cities

The income of an individual household is less important to retailers than the combined income of everyone in the neighborhood. Aside from aggregate, untapped retail demand, urban locations typically offer a critical advantage for retail businesses:

density of demand. The higher population density of most inner-city neighborhoods balances out the high household incomes in spread-out suburban areas, for example:

- Treasury Department analyses indicate that **nationwide,** consumer expenditures per residential square mile average $33,500 in low-income central city new market areas, compared to $25,900 in other parts of the central cities.
- Harlem has an estimated retail demand for food and apparel of $116 million per square mile versus $53 million for the rest of the **New York** metropolitan area.[14]
- Retail demand per square mile in inner-city **Boston** is six times as great as in the Boston metropolitan area as a whole. Not surprisingly, the Super Stop and Shop outlet in Boston's inner city is the highest grossing of that company's 186 supermarkets.
- In inner-city **Oakland,** California, where retail demand per square mile is three times greater than in the Oakland metro area as a whole, Kmart's SuperK store generates 50 percent more in sales than the chain's other outlets.
- In the Chicago metropolitan area, the "Little Village" area of inner-city West Chicago offers retailers $85,018 in spending power per acre compared with $37,754 per acre in Kenilworth on the city's North Shore, despite the fact that the average household income in Kenilworth—the "wealthiest" Chicago neighborhood—is $166,536 per year, compared with just $48,656 in West Chicago.

THE PAYOFF

The growing body of evidence on inner-city retail profitability should come as no surprise, and it extends to urban markets more broadly. The profit motive has driven Sears, Roebuck & Company to dramatically expand its urban presence in the past few years. With annual sales of $75 million to $100 million each, Sears' urban stores are grossing triple the company average.[15] On the inner-city front, the Foot Locker outlet in Harlem has sales exceeding $1,000 per square foot.[16]

Drug stores tend to do especially well in inner-city neighborhoods, in part because they offer a product mix that must be frequently purchased by a wide range of households, in addition to meeting special medical needs. The Rite Aid outlet in Harlem fills more prescriptions per day than any other Rite Aid in New York City.[17]

As indicated by the Stop and Shop example above, grocery stores are among the biggest inner-city retail successes. The Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC), a national community development intermediary, has eased the way for 6 new supermarkets in disadvantaged neighborhoods since 1993, when LISC launched The Retail Initiative, and plans for another 12 supermarkets are underway. The success of these and other stores has transformed many supermarket chains from reluctant participants in such deals to eager investors. "Serving urban neighborhoods has become one of the supermarket industry's latest tactics to boost revenues," *The Wall Street Journal* reported, "since many suburban markets are tapped out."[18]

About one-half of Pathmark stores are located in low-income areas. "Yes, inner-city customers are on a limited budget," Pathmark's Gutman told American Demographics. "Yet there is a huge amount of disposable dollars that go toward the purchase of food and supermarket-type products."[19]

It is not only retail that is profitable in inner-city neighborhoods. According to the Social Compact, a nonprofit economic development organization, Allstate Insurance Companies more than doubled the number of the company's policies written in Chicago's South Shore neighborhood between 1991 and 1995, while its policy growth for the rest of the city was only 0.5 percent. Bank of America and Harris Bank both reported faster growth in lending and banking services in Chicago's low- and moderate-income neighborhoods than in the city as a whole in recent years. And Ameritech Corporation sold more caller-ID and call-waiting services in Chicago's low-income South Shore and Little Village communities than in the rest of the city.[20]

Business expansion into inner-city neighborhoods helps boost not only corporate bottom lines, however. It also boosts the job base and thus the household income of local residents. Pathmark's Bedford-Stuyvesant supermarket employs 150 people, most of them from the Brooklyn area.[21] Similarly, most of the 250 employees in the company's Newark outlet, which was developed in partnership with the nonprofit New Community Corporation, are from the surrounding community.[22]

Promoting quality retail in inner-city neighborhoods is smart community development, not just economic development in the traditional sense of the word. People choose where to move, and whether to stay in place or move on, based on a wide range or "package" of goods that come with housing—things such as the quality of schools and other public services accessible from their homes, the price and quality of the housing itself, and the quality of amenities and shopping available nearby. Seen in this light, good shopping is part of what defines a good urban neighborhood or—some planners would say—a good neighborhood anywhere. Too many low-and moderate-income neighborhoods are defined by what they do not have: a supermarket, bank, pharmacy, or good restaurant.

A number of comprehensive community building initiatives include retail expansion as core elements of their physical plans and development strategies, not just to create jobs but to improve neighborhood quality of life and even health benefits—the nutritional benefits of quality meat and produce, for example. And working together with HUD and other public and private funders through the National Community Development Initiative, LISC (mentioned above) and The Enterprise Foundation are finding new ways to integrate business development into housing and other community development activities. Indeed, community development Corporations (CDCs) and other NCDI stakeholders—including inner-city residents themselves—expect it.[23]

AN INFORMATION GAP INHIBITS INNER-CITY RETAIL GROWTH

As mentioned earlier in this report, even the data above, whether on billion-dollar big-city retail gaps or buying power per square city block, understate the full market potential of urban areas—and of inner cities in particular. The reason is a significant information gap. Traditional sources of business data are often ill-suited to special features of the inner-city marketplace, much of the cash economy goes unrecorded in cities, and rich databases and models that are designed specifically for urban markets are just now appearing.[24]

Weissbourd and Berry described how the lack of statistics designed to capture the true potential of inner-city markets can put a damper on investments in those markets. "While business intelligence on middle- and upper-income consumers abounds, identifying the assets and special market dynamics of low-income communities has not been a focus of traditional business market analysis," they explained. "As a result, standard corporate methods for assessing market strength are inadequate for low-income neighborhoods and tend to underestimate business potential in two ways: first, consumer retail purchasing power is undervalued; and second, unique market characteristics (niche markets, entry barriers, and so forth) are not well understood."[25]

Businesses also need to develop models for analyzing data that are specifically designed to work in an inner-city context. Many firms have found that marketing models for location decisions in suburban contexts, for example, do not work well in inner-city contexts.

Other factors may drive an emphasis on deficiencies instead of assets—including hidden or harder-to-measure assets. States and cities use most of the data gathered about inner cities to apply for Federal aid allocated each year. "[T]he incentive to paint an accurate picture of deficiencies is considerable," Weissbourd and Berry acknowledged. As they viewed it, however, this sends exactly the wrong message to business. "This one-sided picture, in addition to contributing to the isolation and demoralization of inner-city neighborhoods and their residents, heavily contributes to the business sector's failure to look at inner-city neighborhoods as market opportunities."

Just about all market analysis is based on two Federal statistical sources, the U.S. Census and the Consumer Expenditure Survey (CES) of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Private data companies, such as Claritas, Inc., the firm that provided data for use in this report, use these numbers in various combinations to develop sophisticated market intelligence.

But the Census and CES have substantial shortcomings for inner cities. For example, the Census provides income data down to very small areas. That may be a good proxy for buying power in the suburbs, but it does not work in inner cities. Many inner-city households are missed altogether because of the Census undercount, though the Census

Bureau has worked hard to correct this, and many inner-city households rely on an above-average proportion of cash income, which is harder for the households to track and report.

Another major limitation of the Census is that this information is available only every 10 years. In the future, if Congress provides full funding for the ***American Communities Survey,*** local governments, businesses, and community groups will have available—on a timely and current basis—detailed demographic and housing data down to the neighborhood level.

The CES reports expenditures, a better indicator of buying power than assumption-based census estimates. However, the CES provides only national level data. Because suburban markets are much larger and more homogeneous, the national CES data can be used in combination with local Census data to determine market potential of individual suburbs. That does not work for cities because their population is a smaller proportion of the national sample and because city neighborhoods differ substantially from each other. "So, while the Census is rich in local area data, it is a weaker market indicator; the CES is a superior market indicator, but it does not provide the necessary data at a city or neighborhood level."

Weissbourd and Berry cite a grocery store chain, for example, "that finds that it must typically add 20 percent to a leading national market analysis company's estimates of food expenditures in evaluating inner-city markets. This business had the sort of local market expertise that makes it possible to analyze inner-city markets without relying exclusively on third-party data. Unfortunately, the vast majority of businesses do not."

CLOSING THE INFORMATION GAP

The first step is coming up with better market data. To address this, the President has asked the Treasury Department, HUD, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, and other Federal agencies to work together to close the information gap that stands in the way of new investments in economically distressed urban and rural areas—the Nation's new markets.

"[A] great deal of public data already exists that can help provide a positive picture of investment opportunities in inner-city markets," Weissbourd and Berry point out. Less traditional data sets can be examined from a business perspective, and traditional data sets can be adapted and analyzed based on a familiarity with inner-city dynamics.[26] Local governments collect a lot of data that can be used for this purpose, note the authors. The Cook County (Illinois) clerk's office compiles information on assumed name registrations, the names people use for business purposes. Shorebank found these registrations to be a more current indicator of small business activity in Chicago than standard Census data.

The Role of Community Partners

An entrepreneur who enters an inner-city market does not have to guess at what the customers want, need, and are likely to purchase. Most of the inner-city neighborhoods that are likely prospects for business locations have community groups that could make good partners with businesses, serving as a sounding board as well as helping to mediate local disputes and ease community tensions. Lou Collier, an urban development consultant, told an audience of developers, retailers, and others at an International Council of Shopping Centers convention, "[Y]ou need to have someone to facilitate the process, because if you go in with a typical management attitude, the community will assume you view them simply as a commodity to make money off of."[27]

"Getting It": Learning To Do Business in the Inner City

Better market data, and more city-savvy analyses of those data, of course, do not guarantee success. Firms must be willing to incorporate what they learn into the ways they develop, stock, and otherwise operate their stores. The chain drug stores, supermarkets, and department stores that have made a major commitment to the inner city have learned how to navigate through local politics and how to stock and staff their outlets. Rite Aid stores carry health and beauty products favored by the racial and ethnic groups that compose their customer base. In addition, the chain makes sure pharmacists and other staff can communicate with the customers, including a telephone translation service. "If we're in a Chinese-, French-, Russian- or Spanish-speaking community, we do pro-actively hire so we can speak with our customers and hear what they have to say," Suzanne Mead, Rite Aid's vice-president of corporate communications, said.

Similarly, Sears has developed its own brand of women's apparel, created by an African-American designer, called "African Village." In stores with many Asian-American customers, Sears carries an extensive collection of petite sizes; in Hispanic neighborhoods, it stocks smaller shoe sizes.[28]

NEW MARKETS IN RURAL AMERICA: A PREVIEW

The rich, untapped market potential that awaits in America's new markets is not limited to the inner cities. There are new markets in rural America as well, including communities that have been mired in poverty and joblessness for decades—in Appalachia, the Mississippi Delta, Indian Country, and the borderland Colonias, for example. The record-breaking economy presents the Nation with the opportunity to include these and other rural places in the promise of growth and prosperity.

Except for agriculture, timber, and certain extractive industries such as mining, rural communities have often been more isolated from the investment capital that cities attract. The labor force, like the population generally, is more dispersed. Rural regions often present a less diversified economic base—at least initially—than metropolitan areas. And infrastructure is more modest in some areas, especially key regions in Indian Country and the Colonias. Still, rural America has shown countless strengths amidst hard times, with innovative small town governments, committed businesses, community foundations, local nonprofits, faith-based institutions, and other groups taking the lead and with entrepreneurial State and Federal agencies acting as vital partners.

Although rural and urban economies differ in important ways, one thing is clear: major untapped markets exist in rural America as they do in the cities. In fact, thanks to the information revolution and other economic trends, businesses are increasingly mobile. A wider array of businesses can reach their customers from strategic rural locations that offer competitive advantages, such as inexpensive land, lower average labor costs, and more. These highlights of a forthcoming HUD report begin to illustrate the potential:

- ***The Pine Ridge reservation, home to the Oglala Sioux tribe, is the poorest county in the Nation, but even in Pine Ridge, there is $60 million in retail buying power each year.*** The poverty rate in Pine Ridge was almost 63 percent at the most recent census, and 42 percent of adults never graduated from high school. Yet this small population of approximately 11,000 has $60 million to spend on retail needs somewhere. Most of that amount is spent off the reservation because there is so little commercial activity within Pine Ridge—an especially common pattern in Indian Country.
- ***The counties that make up the Mississippi Delta have $95.7 billion in retail purchasing power.*** Poverty in the Delta was almost 21 percent in 1995, and more than one-third (34.1 percent) of adults never graduated from high school. Yet there is significant buying potential—and potential for innovative, higher quality businesses even in communities where stores are meeting most of the area's demand.

- ***The counties that make up the Kentucky Highlands in Appalachia have over $1.3 billion in retail purchasing power.*** Poverty in 1995 was 33.5 percent in the Highlands, and over one-half (54 percent) of adults never graduated from high school. Yet smart finance and partnership building are beginning to mine the untapped buying power, trainable labor force, and more.

Creative businesses, often partnering with smart governments and nonprofit groups, are making profits and growing the job base in these and other rural communities. For example, with financing from the Kentucky Highlands Investment Corporation, a nationally known community development organization, Mid-South Electrics in Jackson County, Kentucky expanded a small operation to employ 850 persons. Mid-South will add a $6 million, 100- to 150-employee expansion this year. Its sales grew 30 percent in the last year alone.

And HUD is working on Pine Ridge to overcome the special barriers to homeownership that many tribes face. HUD has created Shared Visions, a model partnership involving the tribe, the Federal Government, and leading private lenders eager to tap this market. On Pine Ridge and in most low-income communities, housing is often the first step toward broader economic development, since better housing creates retail demand, more stable families able to consume and invest, and construction and other skills that develop the workforce. These are but a few of the businesses—and committed business partners—making it work in America's rural new markets.

CONCLUSION

The huge untapped demand for retail goods in new urban markets means that many of our Nation's retailers are missing major profit-making opportunities. At the same time, the fact that inner-city residents must do so much of their retail shopping outside of the cities means that the full benefits of our economic expansion have not yet extended to low- and moderate-income urban communities—with jobs, quality shopping, and a stronger tax base in all communities.

Working with Congress, the Clinton-Gore Administration has made a major commitment to America's underserved communities and untapped markets over the past 6 years, with **Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities,** a strengthened **Community Reinvestment Act**, the **Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund,** expanded **Affordable Housing Vouchers, 100,000 new community police officers, School Modernization Bonds, Youth Opportunity Areas, Welfare to Work** grants, an expanded **Earned Income Tax Credit,** the **Economic Development Initiative,** and the **Brownfields Economic Development Initiative,** to name a few.

Vice President Gore has spearheaded many of these Administration community empowerment efforts. Chairing the Community Empowerment Board, he has led a broad-based effort to create more jobs and link residents of distressed urban areas to regional job growth. Furthermore, the Vice President has personally visited a great number of Federal Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities.

Unlike failed approaches of previous decades, today's tools work with, not against, the market. These tools leverage private investment and work through smarter government. They are making a difference across America, from Philadelphia to rural South Texas, from Appalachia to inner-city Los Angeles, from the Delta to the great Midwest.

But President Clinton and Vice President Gore want to do even more. They have proposed an expanded agenda to seize the unprecedented opportunity that our economic expansion offers, asking Congress to enact new tools to ensure business growth and community empowerment in the new century. The multi-agency **New Markets Initiative (NMI)** will build a new national network of private investment institutions to provide the capital and expertise needed to flourish in inner cities and distressed rural communities by the full continuum of businesses—from the largest companies to microenterprises. NMI includes seven programs that emphasize equity capital needs in distressed areas. **America's Private Investment Companies (APIC),** jointly administered by HUD and the Small Business Administration (SBA), will create private investment companies to invest in large businesses seeking to expand or locate in low-income communities—investments are expected to total $1.5 billion. **Small Business Investment Companies (SBICs) Targeted to New Markets** will invest between $100,000 and $1 million (per financing) in small businesses, while **New Market Venture Capital Companies** will provide additional venture capital and technical assistance for start-ups. Expanded

support for **Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFIs)** will provide a range of financial products and services directly to small businesses and individuals. **Microenterprises** will receive additional loans and technical assistance. A **New Markets Tax Credit** will help spur $6 billion in private equity investment in low- and moderate-income communities, providing the extra fuel needed for businesses of all sizes to invest and grow. And **BusinessLINC,** which stands for Learning, Information, Networking, and Collaboration, will encourage mentoring relationships between large and small firms.

The private sector will provide the time, energy, and creativity needed for successful investment in low- and moderate-income areas, while entrepreneurial and forward-looking governments help create the needed institutional framework. For example, the **Community Empowerment Fund (CEF)** will streamline two existing HUD programs (grants and loan guarantees) to create jobs in new markets, emphasizing **Welfare to Work Targeted Job Creation** and vital **City-Suburb Business Connections** that connect inner cities to regional economic growth. An innovative pilot, the **CEF Trust,** will standardize underwriting and create loan pools to enable a secondary market for economic development loans. (For details on the Administration's agenda, see Part Two of HUD's 1999 *State of the Cities* report).

Beyond the capital and opportunity gaps addressed by NMI and other initiatives, a significant barrier to major new private investment in underserved urban neighborhoods is the above-mentioned ***information gap*** that understates true market potential in most cities—and in low-income inner-city neighborhoods most of all. This report helps to close that gap, but much work lies ahead.

The new and enhanced initiatives mentioned above—all designed to stimulate investment in untapped markets—will be joined to existing programs with a proven track record in building communities. And a reinvigorated, reinvented HUD is an active, effective community partner nationwide.

The opportunities highlighted in this report are significant for inner-city neighborhoods and for America. Pent-up demand—and the density of that demand—in new urban markets present us with a chance to further two of our most important goals as a Nation: first, to extend the record-breaking economic expansion by identifying new profit opportunities and room for growth; and second, to extend the fruits of that expansion to all Americans, especially those who have yet to participate fully in the Nation's extraordinary rising tide.

APPENDIX: TECHNICAL NOTES ON TABLES AND ANALYSIS

Table 1 uses data on retail trade and aggregate income at the census tract level provided by Claritas, Inc., a private market research firm with headquarters in Arlington, Virginia. "Retail trade" includes such purchases as food, apparel and accessories, auto repair, movies and other recreation, and furnishings (SIC codes 5200–5900, 7200, 7500–7900). Retail trade in the U.S. totaled over $3.8 trillion in 1998.

Retail purchasing power was calculated by taking the ratio of U.S. retail sales to U.S. household income and applying that ratio to aggregate income at the tract level. Retail sales and retail purchasing power for central cities are the sum of tract-level data for census tracts either wholly or predominantly inside these cities. Claritas, Inc. uses proprietary methods to estimate retail sales based on proprietary data on employment and establishments, as well as information from the 1992 Economic Census, which serves as a baseline. Claritas, Inc. uses proprietary methods to estimate aggregate income for census tracts based on the 1990 decennial census, on trends in county income since 1990, and on trends in census tract income between 1980 and 1990.

Excluded from Table 1 are central cities that did not have a retail gap measurable with the best available data last year. Also excluded are the most affluent central cities—such as Palo Alto, California and Stamford, Connecticut—for reasons discussed in the text. These are cities with median household income 1.5 standard deviations or more above the aggregate central city median income as of the 1990 census ($45,600 expressed in 1998 dollars).

"New Market" areas in ***Table 2*** are those low- and moderate-income urban neighborhoods specified in endnote 2 (i.e., census tracts in which 20 percent or more of the population was in poverty in 1989 or in which the median family income for the tract was less than 80 percent of the greater of median family income for the surrounding metropolitan area in 1989 *or* median family income for the State in 1989). Poverty and income data were obtained from the 1990 decennial census. These are the census tracts targeted by the Administration's New Markets Initiative. Data on retail trade and aggregate income at the census tract level were provided by Claritas, Inc., and retail purchasing power was calculated as explained above. Excluded from Table 2 are the inner-city areas that did not have a measurable retail gap last year.

Table 3 provides selected economic indicators, including population, income, poverty, unemployment, and retail sales and retail purchasing power for all 539 central cities in the United States "central cities" of the Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) are defined as follows:[29]

A. The city with the largest population in the MSA;

B. Each additional city with a population of at least 250,000 or with at least 100,000 persons working within its limits;

C. Each additional city with a population of at least 25,000, an employment/residence ratio of at least 0.75, and at least 40 percent of its employed residents working in the city;

D. Each city of 15,000 to 24,999 population that is at least one-third as large as the largest central city, has an employment/residence ratio of at least 0.75, and has at least 40 percent of its employed residents working in the city;

E. The largest city in a secondary noncontiguous urbanized area, provided it has at least 15,000 population, has an employment/residence ratio of at least 0.75, and has at least 40 percent of its employed residents working in the city;

F. Each additional city in a secondary noncontiguous urbanized area that is at least one-third as large as the largest central city of that urbanized area, that has at least 15,000 population and has an employment/residence ration of at least 0.75, and that has at least 40 percent of its employed residents working in the city.

Table 1 Retail Buying Power and Sales Gaps in Central Cities

1998 Estimates of Retail Sales versus Household Purchasing Power for Central Cities

City	State	Retail Sales 1998 ($ millions)	Purchasing Power 1998 ($ millions)	Gap (Purchasing Power minus Sales) ($ millions)	Gap as Percentage of Purchasing Power
New York	NY	$81,611.6	$118,664.3	$37,052.7	31.2%
Chicago	IL	$28,173.4	$38,037.9	$9,864.5	25.9%
Los Angeles	CA	$46,250.3	$51,694.9	$5,444.6	10.5%
San Jose	CA	$11,762.0	$15,707.4	$3,945.4	25.1%
Long Beach	CA	$3,142.3	$5,945.4	$2,803.1	47.1%
Washington	DC	$6,959.6	$9,714.0	$2,754.4	28.4%
San Francisco	CA	$14,175.6	$15,700.1	$1,524.5	9.7%
Detroit	MI	$6,441.3	$7,843.2	$1,401.9	17.9%
Baltimore	MD	$6,013.4	$7,305.3	$1,291.9	17.7%
Jersey City	NJ	$1,905.1	$2,834.8	$929.7	32.8%
Oakland	CA	$4,569.0	$5,473.6	$904.6	16.5%
Bridgeport	CT	$1,098.4	$1,839.1	$740.7	40.3%
Port St. Lucie	FL	$363.9	$1,012.8	$648.9	64.1%
New Haven	CT	$822.6	$1,420.4	$597.8	42.1%
Stockton	CA	$1,760.4	$2,275.5	$515.1	22.6%
Bayonne	NJ	$431.2	$901.7	$470.5	52.2%
Boston	MA	$8,186.2	$8,637.3	$451.1	5.2%
Trenton	NJ	$433.1	$880.6	$447.5	50.8%
Lowell	MA	$780.3	$1,202.8	$422.5	35.1%
Waterbury	CT	$971.8	$1,390.5	$418.7	30.1%
Newark	NJ	$2,052.3	$2,423.6	$371.3	15.3%
Cape Coral	FL	$833.3	$1,170.0	$336.7	28.8%
Buffalo	NY	$2,616.6	$2,924.4	$307.8	10.5%
Philadelphia	PA	$15,548.6	$15,838.4	$289.8	1.8%
Davis	CA	$606.1	$893.4	$287.3	32.2%
Lorain	OH	$405.8	$692.1	$286.3	41.4%
Bradenton	FL	$300.0	$579.3	$279.3	48.2%
Palm Bay	FL	$524.0	$799.2	$275.2	34.4%
St. Petersburg	FL	$3,016.7	$3,288.5	$271.8	8.3%
Seattle	WA	$10,752.6	$11,001.0	$248.4	2.3%
Gary	IN	$685.3	$917.1	$231.8	25.3%
Bethlehem	PA	$660.6	$880.0	$219.4	24.9%
St. Charles	MO	$750.2	$943.2	$193.0	20.5%
Baytown	TX	$754.0	$944.0	$190.0	20.1%
Flint	MI	$1,125.3	$1,311.8	$186.5	14.2%
San Diego	CA	$18,050.7	$18,218.4	$167.7	0.9%
East Lansing	MI	$365.5	$525.4	$159.9	30.4%
Kansas City	KS	$1,230.9	$1,389.9	$159.0	11.4%
Appleton	WI	$935.6	$1,086.3	$150.7	13.9%
Pawtucket	RI	$623.3	$772.0	$148.7	19.3%
Poughkeepsie	NY	$196.6	$340.7	$144.1	42.3%
Wilmington	DE	$922.7	$1,063.3	$140.6	13.2%
Sacramento	CA	$4,510.7	$4,642.7	$132.0	2.8%
Vancouver	WA	$476.1	$603.2	$127.1	21.1%
Urbana	IL	$256.9	$383.8	$126.9	33.1%
Camden	NJ	$376.2	$499.3	$123.1	24.7%
Loveland	CO	$701.0	$823.1	$122.1	14.8%
Suffolk	VA	$579.3	$698.9	$119.6	17.1%
Lompoc	CA	$381.4	$491.8	$110.4	22.4%
Utica	NY	$452.8	$560.2	$107.4	19.2%
Granite City	IL	$309.3	$412.4	$103.1	25.0%
Lancaster	PA	$386.0	$477.3	$91.3	19.1%
Miami Beach	FL	$1,341.1	$1,424.6	$83.5	5.9%
Rockford	IL	$2,133.8	$2,214.2	$80.4	3.6%

Table 1 Retail Buying Power and Sales Gaps in Central Cities (continued)

1998 Estimates of Retail Sales versus Household Purchasing Power for Central Cities

City	State	Retail Sales 1998 ($ millions)	Purchasing Power 1998 ($ millions)	Gap (Purchasing Power minus Sales) ($ millions)	Gap as Percentage of Purchasing Power
Middletown	OH	$540.1	$619.8	$79.7	12.9%
Paradise	CA	$256.6	$336.0	$79.4	23.6%
Berkeley	CA	$1,866.2	$1,942.8	$76.6	3.9%
Clearfield	UT	$224.6	$293.5	$68.9	23.5%
New Bedford	MA	$845.2	$914.1	$68.9	7.5%
Tulare	CA	$324.0	$391.6	$67.6	17.3%
Texarkana	AR	$160.5	$222.5	$62.0	27.9%
Kannapolis	NC	$414.8	$476.1	$61.3	12.9%
Conway	AR	$386.0	$444.7	$58.7	13.2%
Lynn	MA	$904.2	$962.7	$58.5	6.1%
Kenosha	WI	$979.1	$1,035.4	$56.3	5.4%
Gloucester	MA	$387.2	$439.0	$51.8	11.8%
East St. Louis	IL	$177.1	$226.7	$49.6	21.9%
Brockton	MA	$1,055.1	$1,104.5	$49.4	4.5%
Schenectady	NY	$652.2	$700.9	$48.7	7.0%
Chapel Hill	NC	$601.2	$648.7	$47.5	7.3%
Leavenworth	KS	$320.0	$362.7	$42.7	11.8%
Erie	PA	$1,002.6	$1,036.8	$34.2	3.3%
North Chicago	IL	$101.3	$128.7	$27.4	21.3%
Midland	TX	$1,609.2	$1,632.2	$23.0	1.4%
Joliet	IL	$1,125.5	$1,145.6	$20.1	1.8%
Jacksonville	AR	$337.3	$356.0	$18.7	5.3%
Yarmouth	MA	$281.8	$299.7	$17.9	6.0%
Millville	NJ	$294.7	$309.1	$14.4	4.6%
Iowa City	IA	$881.4	$886.3	$4.9	0.6%
Hemet	CA	$352.0	$355.5	$3.5	1.0%
Bremerton	WA	$324.2	$327.6	$3.4	1.0%
Massillon	OH	$267.1	$269.6	$2.5	0.9%

Source: Tract Level Retail Sales and Income Estimates Provided by Claritas, Inc.

NOTE: Only central cities with a measurable retail gap are shown. Retail Sales and Purchasing Power are the sum of these data for census tracts either wholly or predominantly inside these cities. Higher-income cities with retail gaps are excluded from this Table but appear in Table 3. Those are cities with median household income 1.5 standard deviations or more above the overall median household income for central cities, for example Palo Alto, California and Stamford, Connecticut.

Table 2 Retail Buying Power and Sales Gaps in Inner-City "New Markets"

Retail Sales versus Household Purchasing Power, 1998 Estimates, for Low- and Moderate-Income "New Market" Areas within Central Cities

Cities with New Market Eligible Areas	State	New Market Area Estimated Retail Sales 1998 ($ millions)	New Market Area Estimated Purchasing Power 1998 ($ millions)	Gap (Purchasing Power minus Sales) ($ millions)	Gap as Percentage of Purchasing Power
Scottsdale	AZ	$40.0	$60.3	$20.3	33.6%
Jacksonville	AR	$15.0	$57.3	$42.3	73.8%
Jonesboro	AR	$72.0	$126.9	$54.9	43.2%
Texarkana	AR	$79.2	$85.0	$5.8	6.8%
Davis	CA	$305.4	$472.5	$167.1	35.4%
Fairfield	CA	$41.3	$103.8	$62.5	60.2%
Lompoc	CA	$77.9	$153.7	$75.8	49.3%
Long Beach	CA	$1,355.6	$1,467.7	$112.1	7.6%
Paradise	CA	$256.6	$336.0	$79.4	23.6%
Stockton	CA	$989.8	$1,120.0	$130.2	11.6%
Tulare	CA	$168.1	$219.0	$50.9	23.3%
Watts	CA	$779.2	$1,224.7	$445.5	36.4%
Bridgeport	CT	$746.0	$889.7	$143.7	16.1%
New Haven	CT	$707.9	$1,017.1	$309.2	30.4%
Waterbury	CT	$460.1	$475.4	$15.3	3.2%
Washington	DC	$3,894.2	$4,272.8	$378.6	8.9%
Bradenton	FL	$184.6	$221.2	$36.6	16.5%
West Palm Beach	FL	$301.6	$439.9	$138.3	31.4%
Chicago	IL	$13,256.9	$15,522.6	$2,265.7	14.6%
East St. Louis	IL	$177.1	$226.7	$49.6	21.9%
Granite City	IL	$85.7	$141.3	$55.6	39.3%
Joliet	IL	$152.6	$251.0	$98.4	39.2%
North Chicago	IL	$53.2	$104.0	$50.8	48.9%
Gary	IN	$615.7	$753.8	$138.1	18.3%
Gloucester	MA	$160.4	$160.7	$0.3	0.2%
Lowell	MA	$541.4	$597.7	$56.3	9.4%
New Bedford	MA	$774.3	$816.6	$42.3	5.2%
Waltham	MA	$144.2	$155.2	$11.0	7.1%
Westfield	MA	$61.2	$79.2	$18.0	22.7%
Yarmouth	MA	$210.6	$212.3	$1.7	0.8%
Detroit	MI	$4,970.2	$5,411.1	$440.9	8.1%
Flint	MI	$666.2	$805.7	$139.5	17.3%
Pontiac	MI	$531.6	$544.5	$12.9	2.4%
St. Charles	MO	$72.8	$77.8	$5.0	6.4%
Bayonne	NJ	$221.2	$355.2	$134.0	37.7%
Camden	NJ	$376.2	$499.3	$123.1	24.7%
Jersey City	NJ	$1,646.9	$2,333.3	$686.4	29.4%
Newark	NJ	$1,674.6	$2,332.9	$658.3	28.2%
Trenton	NJ	$395.5	$665.4	$269.9	40.6%
Utica	NY	$314.1	$340.2	$26.1	7.7%
Lorain	OH	$153.6	$246.1	$92.5	37.6%
Allentown	PA	$285.1	$307.9	$22.8	7.4%
Bethlehem	PA	$113.6	$143.5	$29.9	20.8%
Lancaster	PA	$290.5	$298.5	$8.0	2.7%
Lebanon	PA	$123.1	$148.9	$25.8	17.3%
Pawtucket	RI	$211.1	$226.6	$15.5	6.8%
Baytown	TX	$207.2	$249.7	$42.5	17.0%
Suffolk	VA	$126.3	$183.2	$56.9	31.1%

Source: Tract Level Retail Sales and Income Estimates Provided by Claritas, Inc

NOTE: "New Market Areas" are census tracts either wholly or predominantly in central cities that met the following criteria according to 1990 Census Data: tract median family income 80 percent or less of the greater of metropolitan area median family income or State median family income; OR tract poverty rate 20 percent or more. Retail gaps in new market areas located in higher-income cities are excluded from this Table but appear in Table 3. Those are cities with median household income 1.5 standard deviations or more above the overall median household income for central cities, for example Palo Alto, California and Stamford, Connecticut. Also excluded are inner-city areas (of central cities) that did not have a measurable gap in 1998. "Areas" refers to the aggregate of inner-city neighborhoods in each central city. For example, New York's area is the aggregate of qualifying census tracts throughout the city.

Table 3 U.S. Central Cities, Selected Economic Indicators

City	State	Population 1996	Change In Population 1980 to 1990	1990 to 1996	1980 to 1996	Median Household Income, 1989 (1998 Dollars)	Unemployment Rate 1992	1998	Poverty Rate 1989	Estimated Poverty Rate 1995	Estimated Retail Purchasing Power, 1998 ($ millions)	Estimated Retail Sales, 1998 ($ millions)
Anniston	AL	25,774	-9.8%	-3.2%	-12.7%	$25,106	17.4%	8.7%	24.4%	28.0%	325.4	845.7
Birmingham	AL	258,543	-6.5%	-2.8%	-9.1%	$25,230	8.4%	4.2%	24.8%	25.6%	2,539.5	3,942.0
Decatur	AL	53,797	16.1%	10.3%	28.1%	$39,442	8.1%	4.0%	12.7%	12.3%	783.1	1,215.1
Dothan	AL	55,944	9.9%	4.4%	14.8%	$33,901	5.6%	3.2%	17.0%	17.2%	759.2	1,699.9
Florence	AL	38,999	-1.6%	7.1%	5.3%	$28,208	9.7%	8.3%	18.5%	16.2%	451.3	804.1
Gadsden	AL	41,155	-10.6%	-3.2%	-13.5%	$25,222	12.5%	5.8%	20.4%	22.9%	444.3	1,079.3
Huntsville	AL	170,424	12.1%	6.7%	19.6%	$42,452	5.1%	2.7%	11.6%	13.1%	2,509.5	3,082.8
Mobile	AL	202,581	-2.1%	3.2%	1.1%	$29,506	8.5%	4.4%	22.4%	24.3%	2,587.3	3,676.3
Montgomery	AL	196,363	5.2%	4.9%	10.4%	$34,586	6.4%	3.2%	18.1%	19.6%	2,461.3	3,308.7
Tuscaloosa	AL	82,379	3.4%	5.9%	9.5%	$25,722	6.9%	3.2%	26.7%	23.3%	1,073.7	1,502.8
Anchorage	AK	250,505	29.8%	10.7%	43.6%	$57,768	7.3%	4.3%	7.1%	8.7%	4,669.0	3,999.2
Flagstaff	AZ	55,094	32.0%	20.1%	58.6%	$37,309	7.4%	5.7%	17.2%	13.7%	730.1	1,163.7
Mesa	AZ	344,764	89.0%	19.7%	126.1%	$39,794	5.6%	2.2%	9.5%	10.9%	4,383.0	4,841.3
Phoenix	AZ	1,159,014	24.5%	17.9%	46.8%	$38,503	7.2%	2.9%	14.2%	16.4%	16,545.5	19,156.1
Scottsdale	AZ	179,012	47.1%	37.6%	102.5%	$51,315	4.8%	1.9%	5.9%	6.1%	4,506.7	4,628.7
Tempe	AZ	162,701	32.9%	14.7%	52.4%	$41,913	5.6%	2.2%	13.6%	15.8%	2,393.5	3,992.4
Tucson	AZ	449,002	22.6%	10.8%	35.8%	$28,588	6.1%	3.0%	20.2%	20.3%	4,645.1	7,837.4
Yuma	AZ	60,519	29.4%	10.2%	42.6%	$35,167	19.0%	18.8%	16.0%	22.4%	673.3	1,165.3
Conway	AR	35,827	30.0%	35.3%	75.8%	$29,302	7.9%	4.7%	16.9%	11.3%	444.7	386.0
Fayetteville	AR	52,360	15.0%	24.4%	43.0%	$27,870	4.0%	3.5%	19.8%	15.2%	583.2	667.0
Fort Smith	AR	75,776	1.6%	4.1%	5.8%	$31,331	7.4%	4.0%	13.8%	15.5%	1,014.9	1,461.6
Jacksonville	AR	29,191	5.5%	0.3%	5.8%	$32,875	9.0%	5.7%	11.6%	12.2%	356.0	337.3
Jonesboro	AR	52,656	47.6%	13.2%	67.0%	$30,652	6.4%	3.9%	16.5%	15.7%	768.1	1,032.2
Little Rock	AR	175,752	10.9%	0.0%	10.9%	$35,346	5.8%	3.6%	14.6%	15.9%	2,981.9	3,749.9
North Little Rock	AR	60,468	-4.0%	-2.1%	-5.9%	$31,493	6.0%	3.8%	17.2%	18.9%	781.2	950.5
Pine Bluff	AR	54,165	0.9%	-5.2%	-4.4%	$25,164	12.8%	8.7%	27.7%	31.8%	548.2	848.8
Rogers	AR	35,355	41.7%	43.2%	102.9%	$34,438	.	.	8.7%	7.5%	539.8	575.1
Springdale	AR	38,572	27.6%	28.8%	64.4%	$33,357	3.4%	3.0%	9.4%	7.8%	514.8	844.4
Texarkana	AR	22,918	5.5%	1.3%	6.8%	$24,997	7.4%	4.7%	25.2%	25.1%	222.5	160.5
West Memphis	AR	26,894	0.4%	-4.8%	-4.4%	$28,988	7.1%	4.1%	22.9%	23.7%	286.9	491.1
Alameda	CA	76,042	19.7%	-0.5%	19.1%	$50,112	4.7%	2.9%	6.8%	6.6%	1,430.2	933.9
Anaheim	CA	288,945	21.5%	8.5%	31.8%	$52,081	7.8%	3.4%	10.6%	14.3%	3,872.4	3,475.4
Atascadero	CA	24,263	42.5%	4.9%	49.5%	$46,192	.	.	7.8%	8.6%	266.9	335.5
Bakersfield	CA	205,508	65.5%	17.6%	94.6%	$42,267	11.6%	8.9%	15.0%	18.2%	2,320.2	2,915.1
Berkeley	CA	103,243	-0.6%	0.5%	-0.1%	$39,091	6.0%	3.8%	17.5%	17.9%	1,942.8	1,866.2
Chico	CA	45,965	50.7%	14.7%	72.8%	$24,982	11.3%	8.0%	32.0%	28.4%	625.4	1,100.6
Coronado	CA	25,701	57.4%	-3.2%	52.4%	$62,821	5.0%	2.4%	4.1%	4.0%	442.5	248.1
Davis	CA	52,321	26.1%	13.2%	42.8%	$38,179	6.1%	4.1%	25.5%	21.3%	893.4	606.1
Paso Robles	CA	20,187	102.8%	8.6%	120.3%	$38,192	.	.	13.8%	14.7%	244.2	371.7
Escondido	CA	116,184	68.8%	6.9%	80.5%	$43,241	7.6%	3.7%	11.2%	15.7%	1,857.7	2,473.1
Fairfield	CA	85,610	32.9%	10.9%	47.4%	$48,487	7.9%	6.0%	7.4%	9.2%	1,066.5	1,150.7

Table 3 U.S. Central Cities, Selected Economic Indicators (continued)

City	State	Population 1996	Change In Population 1980 to 1990	1990 to 1996	1980 to 1996	Median Household Income, 1989 (1998 Dollars)	Unemployment Rate 1992	1998	Poverty Rate 1989	Estimated Poverty Rate 1995	Estimated Retail Purchasing Power, 1998 ($ millions)	Estimated Retail Sales, 1998 ($ millions)
Fresno	CA	396,011	62.3%	11.8%	81.5%	$32,762	14.1%	12.5%	24.0%	28.1%	4,557.1	4,772.2
Gilroy	CA	34,396	45.5%	9.2%	58.9%	$53,836	11.3%	5.4%	12.9%	15.7%	578.3	544.8
Hemet	CA	51,350	60.7%	42.3%	128.7%	$26,792	15.9%	9.3%	14.0%	14.8%	355.5	352.0
Irvine	CA	127,873	77.6%	15.9%	105.8%	$74,244	4.8%	2.0%	6.4%	8.1%	3,103.3	3,231.3
Lancaster	CA	115,675	102.6%	18.9%	140.9%	$50,462	9.3%	6.1%	9.9%	12.6%	1,608.1	1,239.4
Lodi	CA	54,585	47.3%	5.2%	55.0%	$40,407	10.4%	7.8%	12.6%	15.6%	668.5	807.1
Lompoc	CA	40,925	43.3%	8.7%	55.8%	$41,673	10.2%	6.1%	15.1%	15.2%	491.8	381.4
Long Beach	CA	421,904	18.8%	-1.8%	16.8%	$41,983	9.1%	6.0%	16.8%	26.1%	5,945.4	3,142.3
Los Angeles	CA	3,553,638	17.5%	2.0%	19.8%	$40,651	11.1%	7.3%	18.9%	28.6%	51,694.9	46,250.3
Madera	CA	35,648	34.7%	21.7%	64.0%	$28,132	23.6%	18.3%	26.9%	33.0%	251.8	349.8
Merced	CA	58,099	54.0%	3.3%	59.2%	$32,504	16.4%	15.2%	25.1%	33.9%	593.8	858.4
Modesto	CA	178,559	54.5%	8.4%	67.5%	$41,671	14.8%	10.8%	13.0%	16.3%	2,077.5	2,353.8
Monterey	CA	27,722	16.0%	-13.2%	0.6%	$45,649	4.6%	3.9%	6.6%	9.4%	634.7	837.8
Napa	CA	65,030	21.5%	5.2%	27.8%	$46,638	8.1%	4.6%	7.7%	9.9%	1,127.4	919.5
Oakland	CA	367,230	9.7%	-1.3%	8.2%	$35,617	10.1%	6.5%	18.8%	21.1%	5,473.6	4,569.0
Palm Desert	CA	27,916	97.0%	20.1%	136.6%	$49,051			7.1%	9.1%	494.4	506.4
Palm Springs	CA	43,347	24.5%	7.9%	34.3%	$36,199	9.0%	5.1%	12.6%	17.5%	615.5	764.2
Palo Alto	CA	58,304	1.2%	4.3%	5.6%	$72,798	3.6%	1.6%	4.6%	5.8%	1,985.5	913.4
Paradise	CA	25,630	12.6%	0.9%	13.6%	$30,173	9.2%	6.4%	11.1%	11.8%	336.0	256.6
Pasadena	CA	134,116	11.0%	1.9%	13.1%	$46,143	8.4%	5.5%	14.9%	22.4%	2,449.8	2,315.0
Petaluma	CA	48,455	27.6%	12.2%	43.2%	$53,798	5.8%	2.7%	4.2%	5.0%	877.0	719.8
Porterville	CA	34,518	50.0%	16.8%	75.2%	$29,140	19.7%	18.5%	26.8%	31.8%	378.0	530.0
Redding	CA	76,616	58.3%	15.3%	82.4%	$33,951	13.1%	8.9%	14.3%	16.0%	960.2	1,547.4
Riverside	CA	255,069	32.6%	12.6%	49.3%	$45,746	11.5%	6.6%	11.9%	15.7%	2,568.5	3,106.2
Sacramento	CA	376,243	34.0%	1.9%	36.4%	$37,047	9.9%	6.2%	17.2%	22.6%	4,642.7	4,510.7
Salinas	CA	111,757	35.2%	2.7%	38.9%	$41,106	16.0%	14.0%	15.6%	21.1%	1,366.3	1,558.6
San Bernardino	CA	183,474	39.7%	11.8%	56.2%	$33,564	13.4%	8.0%	22.8%	29.6%	1,531.3	1,843.2
Ventura	CA	97,205	24.4%	5.0%	30.7%	$52,984	7.0%	4.3%	6.6%	9.1%	1,753.4	1,833.4
San Diego	CA	1,171,121	26.8%	5.5%	33.8%	$44,281	7.5%	3.7%	13.4%	18.4%	18,218.4	18,050.7
San Francisco	CA	735,315	6.6%	1.6%	8.3%	$43,923	6.9%	3.6%	12.7%	12.3%	15,700.1	14,175.6
San Jose	CA	838,744	24.3%	7.2%	33.3%	$60,739	8.1%	3.8%	9.3%	11.3%	15,707.4	11,762.0
San Luis Obispo	CA	42,433	22.5%	1.1%	23.9%	$34,154	8.4%	4.5%	27.4%	30.0%	572.2	1,171.5
Santa Ana	CA	302,419	44.2%	3.0%	48.5%	$46,221	11.8%	5.2%	18.1%	25.2%	2,563.2	3,604.7
Santa Barbara	CA	86,154	15.0%	0.7%	15.8%	$44,256	6.3%	3.7%	12.7%	14.4%	1,614.8	2,016.4
Santa Clara	CA	98,726	6.7%	5.5%	12.5%	$58,768	6.5%	3.0%	6.2%	7.5%	2,049.2	3,744.1
Santa Cruz	CA	51,155	18.2%	4.3%	23.3%	$41,877	8.5%	6.1%	15.7%	18.6%	831.4	958.5
Santa Maria	CA	67,012	54.4%	9.3%	68.9%	$38,768	10.6%	6.4%	16.8%	17.9%	741.6	866.3
Santa Rosa	CA	121,879	36.0%	7.6%	46.3%	$46,320	6.9%	3.2%	8.3%	10.3%	2,285.7	1,966.9
Stockton	CA	232,660	40.8%	10.3%	55.3%	$35,329	16.3%	12.4%	21.4%	25.8%	2,275.5	1,760.4
Sunnyvale	CA	125,156	10.0%	6.8%	17.4%	$60,997	5.9%	2.7%	4.7%	5.8%	3,115.0	2,433.2
Temecula	CA	39,315		45.1%		$58,194	7.4%	4.2%	4.9%	5.5%	552.7	924.9

Table 3 U.S. Central Cities, Selected Economic Indicators (continued)

City	State	Population 1996	Change in Population 1980 to 1990	Change in Population 1990 to 1996	Change in Population 1980 to 1996	Median Household Income, 1989 (1998 Dollars)	Unemployment Rate 1992	Unemployment Rate 1998	Poverty Rate 1989	Estimated Poverty Rate 1995	Estimated Retail Purchasing Power, 1998 ($ millions)	Estimated Retail Sales, 1998 ($ millions)
Tulare	CA	39,927	47.6%	20.1%	77.2%	$32,450	14.3%	13.4%	21.4%	25.2%	391.6	324.0
Turlock	CA	48,994	60.5%	16.1%	86.4%	$35,877	14.6%	10.6%	13.2%	15.6%	498.5	576.4
Vallejo	CA	109,593	36.0%	0.4%	36.5%	$48,118	8.0%	6.1%	8.5%	11.6%	1,262.9	1,067.5
Visalia	CA	87,787	52.1%	16.1%	76.5%	$38,730	10.9%	10.2%	17.6%	21.3%	1,237.8	1,356.5
Watsonville	CA	32,752	32.1%	5.3%	39.1%	$36,780	19.6%	14.6%	15.3%	18.9%	388.8	420.5
Woodland	CA	42,229	31.6%	6.1%	39.7%	$41,632	8.8%	6.0%	9.6%	8.9%	582.6	634.5
Yuba City	CA	32,433	46.4%	18.2%	73.1%	$30,879	21.7%	17.7%	18.6%	18.9%	371.2	649.2
Boulder	CO	90,928	8.6%	9.1%	18.6%	$38,656	5.3%	3.1%	19.0%	13.5%	1,788.1	2,165.4
Colorado Springs	CO	345,127	30.7%	22.8%	60.4%	$38,026	7.2%	3.9%	10.9%	10.4%	5,330.2	6,368.1
Denver	CO	497,840	-5.0%	6.5%	1.1%	$33,002	6.6%	3.4%	17.1%	17.0%	8,615.7	10,347.2
Fort Collins	CO	104,196	34.8%	18.7%	60.1%	$35,263	5.5%	3.5%	17.0%	12.5%	1,657.9	1,988.7
Grand Junction	CO	34,540	3.2%	19.0%	22.7%	$25,031	9.5%	5.2%	21.6%	16.6%	380.8	1,200.2
Greeley	CO	68,593	14.2%	13.3%	29.4%	$30,841	5.8%	3.9%	19.5%	16.5%	681.5	873.3
Longmont	CO	58,318	20.1%	13.1%	35.8%	$42,766	6.3%	3.7%	7.8%	6.0%	992.0	1,018.6
Loveland	CO	44,923	23.5%	20.3%	48.5%	$40,156	4.9%	3.1%	7.9%	6.1%	823.1	701.0
Pueblo	CO	99,406	-3.0%	0.8%	-2.2%	$26,949	9.7%	6.8%	21.6%	20.2%	1,021.1	1,609.1
Bridgeport	CT	137,990	-0.6%	-2.6%	-3.2%	$37,732	12.3%	6.7%	17.1%	19.6%	1,839.1	1,098.4
Danbury	CT	65,506	8.5%	-0.1%	8.3%	$57,618	7.4%	3.2%	5.8%	6.4%	1,347.0	1,462.2
Hartford	CT	133,086	2.5%	-4.8%	-2.4%	$29,103	12.6%	7.5%	27.5%	35.2%	1,190.6	1,362.7
Meriden	CT	57,189	4.1%	-3.9%	0.1%	$47,600	9.4%	4.6%	7.3%	9.6%	800.8	623.7
Middletown	CT	43,243	9.5%	1.1%	10.8%	$49,484	7.5%	4.1%	7.0%	7.9%	685.6	543.6
New Haven	CT	124,665	3.5%	-4.5%	-1.1%	$33,929	8.5%	4.6%	21.3%	26.4%	1,420.4	822.6
New London	CT	25,038	-1.0%	-12.3%	-13.2%	$34,619	10.0%	6.2%	15.1%	17.4%	264.4	566.7
Norwalk	CT	77,977	0.7%	-0.5%	0.3%	$63,322	6.1%	2.9%	5.2%	6.0%	1,947.6	1,519.0
Norwich	CT	35,869	-1.8%	-4.1%	-5.8%	$38,586	8.5%	5.4%	11.9%	14.3%	501.4	661.3
Stamford	CT	110,056	5.5%	1.9%	7.4%	$65,446	6.5%	2.9%	6.3%	7.1%	3,309.4	1,686.7
Waterbury	CT	106,412	5.5%	-2.3%	3.0%	$40,136	11.3%	5.5%	12.1%	15.7%	1,390.5	971.8
Dover	DE	30,414	17.5%	10.1%	29.4%	$41,155	5.6%	4.0%	12.5%	11.6%	458.8	851.4
Newark	DE	27,870	-0.6%	11.0%	10.4%	$50,719	5.6%	2.3%	17.4%	15.1%	367.8	500.5
Wilmington	DE	69,490	1.9%	-2.9%	-1.0%	$34,689	7.1%	4.9%	18.1%	22.7%	1,063.3	922.7
Washington	DC	543,213	-4.9%	-10.5%	-14.9%	$40,391	8.6%	8.6%	16.9%	20.8%	9,714.0	6,959.6
Boca Raton	FL	68,507	24.2%	11.4%	38.4%	$55,622	6.7%	3.8%	5.5%	7.1%	1,547.5	1,266.4
Bradenton	FL	47,219	45.1%	7.9%	56.5%	$34,191	6.9%	2.9%	12.8%	15.0%	579.3	300.0
Cape Coral	FL	88,053	133.6%	17.4%	174.3%	$40,983	7.2%	3.1%	5.9%	7.3%	1,170.0	833.3
Clearwater	FL	100,132	15.5%	1.4%	17.1%	$34,799	7.0%	3.4%	10.7%	14.4%	1,627.1	2,772.4
Daytona Beach	FL	65,203	14.3%	5.3%	20.4%	$24,491	10.0%	4.7%	22.5%	28.0%	813.1	1,883.3
Fort Lauderdale	FL	151,805	-2.5%	1.6%	-1.0%	$35,806	10.5%	5.9%	17.1%	22.2%	2,720.6	3,926.1
Fort Myers	FL	45,917	23.4%	1.6%	25.3%	$29,053	10.2%	4.4%	20.7%	28.0%	560.7	1,522.2
Fort Pierce	FL	36,876	9.0%	0.1%	9.1%	$24,861	25.1%	17.6%	29.2%	39.3%	295.3	618.9
Fort Walton Beach	FL	21,933	3.1%	2.2%	5.3%	$37,232			10.2%	12.2%	275.1	597.5
Gainesville	FL	87,295	4.2%	3.0%	7.3%	$27,706	5.6%	3.1%	26.3%	21.3%	907.2	1,661.1

Table 3 U.S. Central Cities, Selected Economic Indicators (continued)

City	State	Population 1996	Change in Population 1980 to 1990	Change in Population 1990 to 1996	Change in Population 1980 to 1996	Median Household Income, 1989 (1998 Dollars)	Unemployment Rate 1992	Unemployment Rate 1998	Poverty Rate 1989	Estimated Poverty Rate 1995	Estimated Retail Purchasing Power, 1998 ($ millions)	Estimated Retail Sales, 1998 ($ millions)
Jacksonville	FL	679,792	17.4%	7.0%	25.7%	$37,207	7.0%	3.3%	13.0%	14.7%	9,508.4	11,959.4
Lakeland	FL	73,157	48.9%	3.7%	54.3%	$32,156	10.0%	5.2%	14.0%	18.6%	887.2	1,705.7
Melbourne	FL	67,631	28.2%	13.4%	45.3%	$34,037	9.0%	5.1%	12.8%	15.9%	678.5	1,248.2
Miami	FL	365,127	3.4%	1.8%	5.3%	$22,248	15.0%	9.6%	31.2%	42.8%	3,174.5	5,937.7
Miami Beach	FL	94,540	-3.8%	2.1%	-1.8%	$20,128	12.2%	7.8%	25.2%	35.2%	1,424.6	1,341.1
Naples	FL	19,777	10.9%	1.4%	12.5%	$56,719	.	.	6.2%	8.4%	777.3	916.2
Ocala	FL	44,975	13.1%	7.0%	21.0%	$28,612	9.0%	4.6%	19.9%	25.6%	521.6	1,308.5
Orlando	FL	173,902	28.4%	5.6%	35.6%	$34,334	7.9%	3.4%	15.8%	18.6%	2,237.5	3,129.5
Palm Bay	FL	74,982	237.5%	19.7%	304.0%	$39,813	8.1%	4.6%	8.7%	10.5%	799.2	524.0
Panama City	FL	35,986	3.1%	4.7%	7.9%	$28,763	10.9%	8.2%	19.6%	22.3%	483.5	1,152.5
Pensacola	FL	59,162	0.9%	1.7%	2.7%	$32,950	6.1%	4.3%	18.9%	22.2%	888.5	1,172.1
Port St. Lucie	FL	75,532	280.3%	35.2%	414.2%	$42,791	12.5%	8.3%	5.4%	5.6%	1,012.8	363.9
Punta Gorda	FL	12,552	58.1%	16.8%	84.7%	$44,901	.	.	8.4%	11.2%	284.9	340.4
St. Petersburg	FL	235,988	0.0%	-1.1%	-1.1%	$30,992	7.6%	3.7%	13.6%	18.8%	3,288.5	3,016.7
Sarasota	FL	50,891	4.3%	-0.1%	4.1%	$32,710	6.7%	3.0%	13.3%	18.2%	833.4	1,254.2
Tallahassee	FL	136,812	53.0%	9.6%	67.8%	$30,829	4.8%	3.7%	22.3%	18.7%	1,957.2	2,751.1
Tampa	FL	285,206	3.1%	1.9%	5.0%	$29,934	8.8%	3.6%	19.4%	24.8%	3,975.8	6,364.6
Titusville	FL	41,543	23.5%	5.5%	30.2%	$37,365	7.8%	4.4%	10.6%	14.2%	517.1	754.7
West Palm Beach	FL	79,305	6.9%	17.2%	25.3%	$34,840	12.9%	7.4%	16.2%	20.2%	1,344.1	1,745.6
Winter Haven	FL	25,484	17.1%	3.1%	20.7%	$31,147	.	.	13.5%	18.3%	293.9	551.3
Albany	GA	78,591	5.5%	0.6%	6.1%	$28,768	11.2%	8.9%	27.5%	28.9%	919.9	1,440.7
Athens	GA	89,405	7.5%	95.5%	110.1%	$18,779	6.3%	3.0%	39.3%	21.0%	351.6	568.2
Atlanta	GA	401,907	-7.3%	2.0%	-5.4%	$29,281	10.0%	5.2%	27.3%	33.6%	7,032.1	8,295.1
Augusta	GA	41,783	-6.1%	-6.4%	-12.1%	$20,132	12.7%	6.7%	33.3%	42.7%	315.9	556.5
Columbus	GA	182,828	5.5%	2.3%	7.9%	$31,682	7.3%	5.0%	18.6%	20.6%	2,264.5	2,599.5
Macon	GA	113,352	-8.8%	6.3%	-3.0%	$27,655	8.1%	6.7%	24.4%	26.8%	1,280.9	2,001.6
Savannah	GA	136,262	-2.7%	-0.9%	-3.6%	$29,053	8.0%	5.3%	22.6%	26.8%	1,404.0	2,567.0
Honolulu	HI	423,475	0.1%	15.9%	16.0%	$48,887	3.0%	5.0%	8.4%	9.4%	7,339.4	6,890.8
Boise City	ID	152,737	22.7%	21.5%	49.1%	$38,280	4.2%	3.1%	9.4%	9.4%	2,746.0	2,923.4
Nampa	ID	37,558	13.0%	32.4%	49.6%	$25,891	7.2%	5.4%	18.5%	17.2%	324.8	406.6
Pocatello	ID	51,344	-0.6%	11.4%	10.8%	$32,804	7.4%	4.7%	15.3%	14.6%	625.5	816.6
Alton	IL	31,562	-3.7%	-4.1%	-7.6%	$30,166	9.3%	7.0%	19.9%	19.4%	289.4	427.1
Aurora	IL	116,405	22.5%	16.9%	43.2%	$46,059	9.3%	4.5%	10.5%	10.0%	1,468.1	1,276.0
Belleville	IL	41,608	2.9%	-2.8%	0.1%	$35,056	13.8%	8.5%	9.0%	8.5%	561.8	582.8
Bloomington	IL	57,365	17.6%	10.4%	29.8%	$38,586	3.9%	2.7%	10.0%	6.8%	1,012.4	1,388.6
Champaign	IL	64,002	9.2%	0.8%	10.1%	$30,190	2.2%	2.9%	22.7%	15.9%	1,019.0	1,649.5
Chicago	IL	2,721,547	-7.4%	-2.2%	-9.4%	$34,573	9.5%	5.6%	21.6%	22.8%	38,037.9	28,173.4
Decatur	IL	81,369	-10.8%	-3.0%	-13.5%	$33,456	11.0%	6.8%	15.9%	16.0%	1,104.9	1,397.2
DeKalb	IL	35,554	5.5%	1.8%	7.4%	$33,372	5.1%	3.0%	24.4%	12.8%	388.6	556.3
East St. Louis	IL	38,595	-25.8%	-5.7%	-30.1%	$16,598	14.0%	9.6%	43.9%	44.3%	226.7	177.1
Elgin	IL	86,034	20.7%	11.7%	34.9%	$46,736	8.9%	5.4%	7.8%	7.5%	1,163.8	928.7

Table 3 U.S. Central Cities, Selected Economic Indicators (continued)

City	State	Population 1996	Change in Population 1980 to 1990	1990 to 1996	1980 to 1996	Median Household Income, 1989 (1998 Dollars)	Unemployment Rate 1992	1998	Poverty Rate 1989	Estimated Poverty Rate 1995	Estimated Retail Purchasing Power, 1998 ($ millions)	Estimated Retail Sales, 1998 ($ millions)
Evanston	IL	71,593	-0.6%	-2.2%	-2.9%	$54,046	5.3%	3.5%	9.8%	9.4%	1,632.7	1,235.4
Granite City	IL	31,449	-10.7%	-4.3%	-14.6%	$33,649	12.6%	6.8%	13.2%	13.1%	412.4	309.3
Joliet	IL	86,749	-1.4%	12.9%	11.3%	$40,707	13.2%	7.4%	13.0%	13.2%	1,145.6	1,125.5
Kankakee	IL	27,217	-8.5%	-1.3%	-9.7%	$26,721	13.1%	9.6%	23.5%	22.4%	290.0	421.0
Moline	IL	42,757	-5.5%	-1.0%	-6.5%	$36,165	7.4%	3.8%	10.3%	9.2%	628.6	652.5
Normal	IL	42,655	12.2%	6.6%	19.6%	$41,244	2.6%	2.0%	21.7%	12.6%	637.8	927.3
North Chicago	IL	31,665	-9.8%	-9.5%	-18.3%	$33,520	10.7%	10.3%	14.9%	12.0%	128.7	101.3
Pekin	IL	32,433	-5.0%	0.6%	-4.5%	$33,123	9.8%	5.0%	13.9%	12.1%	337.1	597.1
Peoria	IL	112,306	-8.6%	-1.1%	-9.5%	$34,275	8.5%	4.5%	18.9%	17.6%	1,561.1	2,606.7
Rockford	IL	143,531	-0.2%	2.9%	2.7%	$37,177	12.0%	6.5%	13.4%	12.6%	2,214.2	2,133.8
Rock Island	IL	39,679	-13.8%	-2.2%	-15.6%	$31,721	7.2%	4.0%	19.3%	16.7%	424.2	459.0
Springfield	IL	112,921	5.6%	7.3%	13.3%	$36,800	6.7%	4.9%	12.6%	11.7%	1,608.3	1,916.3
Urbana	IL	33,179	1.0%	-8.7%	-7.8%	$28,532	5.1%	3.2%	21.8%	15.1%	383.8	256.9
Anderson	IN	59,131	-8.1%	-0.6%	-8.6%	$30,524	9.8%	4.5%	18.0%	16.1%	684.8	1,410.7
Bloomington	IN	66,479	16.5%	9.6%	27.7%	$24,178	5.2%	3.0%	31.5%	16.7%	736.4	1,017.2
East Chicago	IN	31,761	-14.8%	-6.3%	-20.2%	$25,490	14.5%	6.9%	25.6%	26.3%	258.8	286.1
Elkhart	IN	44,224	5.6%	1.4%	7.1%	$33,245	7.8%	3.2%	12.5%	14.7%	654.2	1,412.9
Evansville	IN	123,456	-3.2%	-2.2%	-5.4%	$30,150	7.9%	3.7%	14.6%	14.6%	1,574.0	2,928.7
Fort Wayne	IN	184,783	0.5%	6.8%	7.3%	$34,630	7.9%	3.4%	11.5%	12.3%	2,214.1	3,014.0
Gary	IN	110,975	-23.2%	-4.9%	-27.0%	$25,488	17.0%	8.2%	29.4%	29.8%	917.1	685.3
Goshen	IN	24,930	21.0%	4.8%	26.8%	$38,032	5.4%	2.2%	7.6%	8.5%	423.0	540.1
Indianapolis	IN	746,737	4.4%	2.1%	6.6%	$38,129	5.9%	2.8%	12.5%	13.3%	11,007.6	15,820.0
Kokomo	IN	45,785	-6.0%	1.8%	-4.2%	$34,535	8.8%	3.8%	16.4%	13.9%	609.3	1,034.4
Lafayette	IN	44,344	1.8%	1.3%	3.1%	$35,522	3.6%	1.9%	8.9%	7.0%	632.8	1,119.3
Muncie	IN	69,058	-8.0%	-2.8%	-10.6%	$25,440	9.3%	5.0%	23.8%	19.5%	757.5	1,431.1
New Albany	IN	38,224	-2.1%	5.2%	3.0%	$31,460	6.4%	2.8%	15.5%	13.8%	444.8	508.7
South Bend	IN	102,100	-3.8%	-3.2%	-7.0%	$31,721	9.6%	3.7%	14.4%	16.8%	1,103.7	1,340.7
Terre Haute	IN	54,585	-6.0%	-5.0%	-10.7%	$25,131	8.2%	5.5%	20.4%	18.6%	518.6	1,270.1
Cedar Falls	IA	34,884	-5.6%	1.7%	-4.0%	$36,810	5.4%	2.8%	16.8%	11.3%	460.6	634.1
Cedar Rapids	IA	113,482	-1.4%	4.4%	2.9%	$41,352	4.5%	1.9%	10.0%	9.2%	1,948.6	2,573.7
Council Bluffs	IA	55,569	-3.8%	2.3%	-1.6%	$32,881	5.9%	2.7%	12.2%	12.6%	653.3	1,178.1
Davenport	IA	97,010	-7.7%	1.8%	-6.1%	$34,464	6.9%	3.1%	15.6%	15.1%	1,180.0	1,963.2
Des Moines	IA	193,422	1.1%	0.1%	1.3%	$35,102	4.7%	2.6%	12.9%	12.8%	2,591.2	3,270.0
Dubuque	IA	57,312	-7.7%	-0.4%	-8.0%	$35,527	6.1%	3.3%	10.9%	9.2%	741.2	1,247.9
Iowa City	IA	60,923	18.3%	2.0%	20.6%	$32,291	3.4%	2.2%	23.4%	12.7%	886.3	881.4
Sioux City	IA	83,791	-1.8%	4.1%	2.2%	$32,922	4.7%	3.0%	13.8%	11.0%	1,081.1	1,597.2
Waterloo	IA	65,022	-12.5%	-2.2%	-14.4%	$30,994	7.6%	4.0%	16.9%	13.7%	814.4	1,322.1
Kansas City	KS	142,654	-7.0%	-4.7%	-11.4%	$30,637	8.5%	7.3%	17.9%	19.9%	1,389.9	1,230.9
Lawrence	KS	71,887	24.4%	9.6%	36.3%	$30,102	4.4%	4.4%	24.1%	14.7%	906.3	1,335.6
Leavenworth	KS	39,431	14.4%	2.4%	17.2%	$39,641	5.9%	4.8%	9.5%	11.0%	362.7	320.0
Olathe	KS	78,666	70.0%	24.2%	111.1%	$52,242	3.4%	2.8%	4.1%	3.9%	1,414.8	1,858.2

Table 3 U.S. Central Cities, Selected Economic Indicators (continued)

City	State	Population 1996	Change in Population 1980 to 1990	1990 to 1996	1980 to 1996	Median Household Income, 1989 (1998 Dollars)	Unemployment Rate 1992	1998	Poverty Rate 1989	Estimated Poverty Rate 1995	Estimated Retail Purchasing Power, 1998 ($ millions)	Estimated Retail Sales, 1998 ($ millions)
Topeka	KS	119,658	4.0%	-0.2%	3.8%	$35,195	5.1%	4.9%	12.3%	12.5%	1,451.2	2,601.5
Wichita	KS	320,395	8.9%	5.4%	14.7%	$36,838	4.6%	3.4%	12.5%	13.6%	4,684.5	5,772.0
Ashland	KY	22,918	-12.7%	-3.0%	-15.3%	$28,793	11.4%	5.0%	18.1%	18.9%	245.5	560.1
Henderson	KY	26,456	4.5%	2.0%	6.5%	$29,031	8.1%	6.7%	17.0%	16.4%	237.7	418.9
Hopkinsville	KY	28,317	9.1%	-5.0%	3.7%	$28,068	6.0%	3.4%	21.8%	23.7%	343.2	583.1
Lexington-Fayette	KY	239,942	10.4%	6.5%	17.5%	$36,880	3.7%	1.8%	14.1%	13.3%	3,870.7	4,458.9
Louisville	KY	260,689	-9.8%	-3.1%	-12.7%	$26,476	6.8%	4.0%	22.6%	24.3%	3,020.7	3,837.6
Owensboro	KY	54,350	-1.7%	1.5%	-0.2%	$28,856	8.3%	4.7%	18.9%	18.6%	661.9	1,077.7
Alexandria	LA	46,051	-4.6%	-6.4%	-10.7%	$24,379	10.1%	6.9%	28.8%	29.2%	536.7	942.5
Baton Rouge	LA	215,882	0.1%	-1.7%	-1.6%	$28,785	6.6%	4.7%	26.2%	24.1%	2,777.5	4,792.0
Bossier City	LA	55,686	3.7%	5.6%	9.6%	$34,070	7.2%	5.3%	16.0%	13.6%	723.6	1,375.2
Houma	LA	30,148	-6.5%	-1.1%	-7.5%	$25,498	9.9%	3.5%	26.4%	22.9%	421.6	481.7
Lafayette	LA	104,899	15.2%	11.1%	28.0%	$30,799	8.0%	4.5%	21.9%	16.6%	1,497.3	1,901.3
Lake Charles	LA	71,445	-6.2%	1.2%	-5.0%	$27,901	11.2%	6.3%	23.6%	21.7%	984.7	1,426.8
Monroe	LA	54,588	-4.7%	-0.6%	-5.2%	$21,325	9.3%	7.3%	37.8%	35.0%	585.3	1,178.6
New Orleans	LA	476,625	-10.9%	-4.1%	-14.5%	$24,288	7.2%	5.5%	31.6%	33.6%	5,288.5	5,421.5
Shreveport	LA	191,558	-3.5%	-3.5%	-6.9%	$29,023	7.8%	6.2%	25.3%	24.2%	2,279.5	3,043.0
Slidell	LA	25,846	-9.7%	7.1%	-3.3%	$45,340	5.3%	3.0%	10.1%	9.6%	353.8	523.0
Auburn	ME	22,997	5.1%	-5.4%	-0.6%	$36,140	8.7%	4.2%	10.9%	12.0%	269.0	770.2
Bangor	ME	31,649	4.9%	-4.6%	0.0%	$32,434	6.8%	3.4%	15.0%	17.4%	362.8	1,195.2
Lewiston	ME	36,830	-1.8%	-7.4%	-9.0%	$31,615	9.1%	4.4%	13.9%	15.2%	379.2	499.8
Portland	ME	63,123	4.5%	-1.9%	2.5%	$34,935	6.3%	2.8%	14.0%	17.0%	873.2	1,701.6
Annapolis	MD	33,234	4.6%	0.1%	4.7%	$46,686	9.7%	6.0%	12.1%	16.1%	566.3	1,075.5
Baltimore	MD	675,401	-6.5%	-8.2%	-14.2%	$31,608	11.0%	8.7%	21.9%	24.0%	7,305.3	6,013.4
Cumberland	MD	22,341	-8.6%	-5.8%	-13.9%	$21,613			26.4%	27.2%	238.1	444.3
Frederick	MD	46,227	42.9%	15.1%	64.6%	$45,865	6.5%	3.5%	8.0%	9.1%	675.5	1,272.0
Hagerstown	MD	34,633	3.8%	-2.3%	1.5%	$30,049	9.7%	4.3%	15.8%	19.3%	335.5	631.0
Attleboro	MA	39,070	12.2%	1.8%	14.3%	$48,152	10.6%	4.0%	6.4%	7.4%	531.1	549.7
Barnstable	MA	43,699	32.5%	6.7%	41.4%	$43,919	10.2%	4.0%	6.8%	7.3%	698.2	1,316.7
Boston	MA	558,394	2.0%	-2.8%	-0.8%	$38,358	8.0%	3.3%	18.7%	18.2%	8,637.3	8,186.2
Brockton	MA	92,324	-2.5%	-0.5%	-3.0%	$41,686	12.3%	4.4%	13.6%	17.0%	1,104.5	1,055.1
Cambridge	MA	93,707	0.5%	-2.2%	-1.7%	$43,563	5.4%	1.9%	10.7%	12.4%	1,737.6	2,455.0
Fall River	MA	90,865	0.1%	-2.0%	-1.8%	$29,514	15.1%	6.6%	14.3%	17.0%	883.2	901.4
Fitchburg	MA	39,843	4.1%	-3.3%	0.7%	$35,625	10.5%	4.4%	14.0%	17.0%	412.9	596.3
Gloucester	MA	29,267	3.4%	1.9%	5.4%	$42,972	14.2%	5.3%	7.5%	8.1%	439.0	387.2
Holyoke	MA	41,461	-2.2%	-5.1%	-7.2%	$30,047	10.8%	5.5%	25.7%	28.7%	358.6	656.6
Lawrence	MA	68,807	11.1%	-2.0%	8.9%	$29,160	14.4%	8.5%	27.5%	30.3%	577.9	661.1
Leominster	MA	39,263	10.5%	2.9%	13.8%	$47,288	8.6%	3.8%	7.2%	8.6%	586.9	659.3
Lowell	MA	100,973	11.9%	-2.4%	9.3%	$38,582	12.6%	4.3%	18.0%	23.4%	1,202.8	780.3
Lynn	MA	80,563	3.5%	-0.8%	2.7%	$37,533	10.8%	4.0%	15.9%	17.5%	962.7	904.2
New Bedford	MA	96,903	1.5%	-3.0%	-1.6%	$29,770	14.8%	8.1%	16.8%	20.1%	914.1	845.2

Table 3 U.S. Central Cities, Selected Economic Indicators (continued)

City	State	Population 1996	Change in Population 1980 to 1990	1990 to 1996	1980 to 1996	Median Household Income, 1989 (1998 Dollars)	Unemployment Rate 1992	1998	Poverty Rate 1989	Estimated Poverty Rate 1995	Estimated Retail Purchasing Power, 1998 ($ millions)	Estimated Retail Sales, 1998 ($ millions)
Northampton	MA	28,838	0.0%	-1.5%	-1.5%	$40,878	6.9%	2.4%	11.5%	9.0%	346.4	540.2
Pittsfield	MA	46,315	-6.4%	-4.7%	-10.9%	$39,418	11.4%	4.2%	9.7%	11.4%	643.0	768.3
Springfield	MA	149,948	3.1%	-4.5%	-1.6%	$33,725	10.9%	5.1%	20.1%	22.0%	1,374.6	1,689.6
Waltham	MA	57,214	-0.6%	-1.1%	-1.7%	$50,627	7.7%	2.5%	6.5%	7.6%	888.7	1,915.6
Westfield	MA	37,539	5.2%	-2.2%	2.9%	$44,034	8.1%	3.3%	8.0%	8.4%	438.7	502.3
Worcester	MA	166,350	4.9%	-2.0%	2.8%	$38,062	9.3%	3.6%	15.3%	18.0%	1,908.8	2,100.5
Yarmouth	MA	22,335	14.8%	5.5%	21.1%	$35,784	10.6%	4.7%	9.5%	10.5%	299.7	281.8
Ann Arbor	MI	108,758	1.5%	-0.8%	0.7%	$43,831	4.2%	1.5%	16.1%	11.7%	2,178.3	2,238.4
Battle Creek	MI	53,430	49.9%	-0.2%	49.6%	$33,265	8.5%	4.5%	18.3%	18.9%	732.8	1,008.0
Bay City	MI	36,548	-6.4%	-6.1%	-12.1%	$28,104	12.1%	6.2%	18.1%	19.9%	398.1	465.7
Benton Harbor	MI	11,824	-12.8%	-7.8%	-19.6%	$11,923	.	.	58.0%	64.3%	57.9	81.7
Dearborn	MI	91,418	-1.5%	2.4%	0.8%	$45,888	5.3%	2.0%	10.8%	11.5%	1,489.5	2,091.9
Detroit	MI	1,000,272	-14.6%	-2.7%	-16.9%	$24,637	17.0%	7.0%	32.4%	33.1%	7,843.2	6,441.3
East Lansing	MI	48,192	-1.4%	-4.9%	-6.2%	$32,490	6.6%	3.6%	33.8%	21.1%	525.4	365.5
Flint	MI	134,881	-11.8%	-4.2%	-15.5%	$26,522	20.0%	9.8%	30.6%	30.4%	1,311.8	1,125.3
Grand Rapids	MI	188,242	4.0%	-0.5%	3.5%	$35,241	10.3%	4.0%	16.1%	17.5%	2,382.5	3,050.7
Holland	MI	33,247	17.0%	8.1%	26.5%	$40,341	7.4%	3.1%	11.8%	9.9%	466.6	781.7
Jackson	MI	35,899	-5.8%	-4.1%	-9.7%	$27,381	13.7%	5.3%	24.7%	28.0%	328.9	599.3
Kalamazoo	MI	77,460	0.7%	-3.5%	-2.8%	$30,506	8.2%	4.0%	26.2%	21.5%	857.9	1,158.6
Lansing	MI	125,736	-2.4%	-1.2%	-3.6%	$34,701	7.4%	4.1%	19.4%	17.8%	1,623.9	2,235.1
Midland	MI	39,849	2.2%	4.7%	7.0%	$50,934	5.3%	2.2%	9.5%	8.4%	788.8	864.3
Muskegon	MI	39,518	-1.3%	-1.9%	-3.2%	$24,645	14.3%	5.7%	26.5%	26.0%	331.6	589.4
Pontiac	MI	70,471	-7.2%	-1.0%	-8.1%	$28,869	19.0%	7.2%	26.7%	28.3%	640.1	683.2
Port Huron	MI	32,873	-0.8%	-2.4%	-3.3%	$28,291	13.9%	5.9%	22.1%	21.3%	324.0	442.3
Saginaw	MI	65,014	-10.3%	-6.5%	-16.1%	$23,314	14.5%	7.9%	31.7%	32.8%	509.7	528.3
Duluth	MN	83,699	-7.9%	-2.1%	-9.8%	$30,720	6.5%	3.5%	16.6%	14.0%	1,102.6	1,572.3
Minneapolis	MN	358,785	-0.7%	-2.6%	-3.3%	$33,289	5.0%	2.5%	18.5%	18.7%	5,457.1	5,901.7
Moorhead	MN	33,343	7.7%	3.2%	11.2%	$31,897	3.2%	1.6%	19.9%	16.0%	338.1	371.8
Rochester	MN	75,638	22.2%	6.9%	30.7%	$45,906	3.2%	1.6%	7.8%	7.4%	1,444.8	1,976.6
St. Cloud	MN	50,801	14.7%	4.1%	19.3%	$31,554	4.9%	2.9%	19.6%	14.4%	653.7	1,189.2
St. Paul	MN	259,606	0.7%	-4.6%	-3.9%	$34,832	5.3%	2.5%	16.7%	16.6%	3,660.5	4,571.1
Biloxi	MS	48,414	-6.1%	4.5%	-1.8%	$26,059	8.4%	4.6%	21.4%	18.0%	554.2	991.1
Gulfport	MS	64,829	2.8%	59.0%	63.4%	$27,834	10.3%	4.0%	20.3%	12.0%	514.2	773.4
Hattiesburg	MS	47,803	2.6%	14.1%	17.1%	$20,475	7.7%	4.0%	35.9%	25.4%	417.2	677.6
Jackson	MS	192,923	-3.1%	-1.9%	-4.9%	$30,589	7.0%	4.2%	22.7%	23.2%	2,422.9	3,795.1
Pascagoula	MS	27,026	-11.7%	4.4%	-7.8%	$32,845	8.9%	4.8%	19.7%	18.0%	307.4	486.0
Columbia	MO	76,756	11.3%	11.1%	23.7%	$28,997	2.6%	1.6%	22.4%	15.7%	1,020.8	1,762.6
Joplin	MO	43,698	5.3%	6.7%	12.4%	$25,528	5.7%	4.1%	17.0%	16.9%	569.0	953.9
Kansas City	MO	441,259	-2.9%	1.4%	-1.5%	$35,115	6.2%	4.4%	15.3%	17.5%	6,165.0	8,308.7
St. Charles	MO	56,525	46.0%	3.6%	51.2%	$45,135	4.9%	2.8%	6.5%	7.8%	943.2	750.2
St. Joseph	MO	70,208	-6.3%	-2.3%	-8.5%	$29,318	7.5%	5.0%	16.7%	16.9%	744.3	1,163.3

Table 3 U.S. Central Cities, Selected Economic Indicators (continued)

City	State	Population 1996	Change in Population 1980 to 1990	Change in Population 1990 to 1996	Change in Population 1980 to 1996	Median Household Income, 1989 (1998 Dollars)	Unemployment Rate 1992	Unemployment Rate 1998	Poverty Rate 1989	Estimated Poverty Rate 1995	Estimated Retail Purchasing Power, 1998 ($ millions)	Estimated Retail Sales, 1998 ($ millions)
St. Louis	MO	351,565	-12.4%	-11.4%	-22.4%	$25,578	8.3%	7.2%	24.6%	29.5%	3,659.8	5,703.9
Springfield	MO	143,407	5.5%	2.1%	7.7%	$28,363	5.0%	3.1%	17.8%	17.1%	1,995.4	3,933.6
Billings	MT	91,195	21.5%	12.4%	36.5%	$33,703	5.5%	4.1%	12.5%	12.1%	1,256.7	2,163.7
Great Falls	MT	57,758	-2.9%	4.8%	1.8%	$30,382	6.6%	5.5%	14.7%	14.9%	753.6	1,164.7
Missoula	MT	51,204	28.5%	19.3%	53.4%	$27,648	7.3%	4.8%	19.0%	16.9%	673.5	1,020.3
Lincoln	NE	209,192	11.7%	9.0%	21.7%	$36,880	2.9%	1.6%	11.3%	9.5%	3,033.4	4,322.9
Omaha	NE	364,253	6.9%	8.5%	15.9%	$35,396	3.9%	2.4%	12.6%	11.9%	5,635.4	8,422.3
Las Vegas	NV	376,906	56.9%	45.9%	128.9%	$40,211	6.6%	4.0%	11.5%	11.9%	6,803.0	7,466.1
Reno	NV	155,499	32.8%	16.2%	54.3%	$37,316	6.7%	4.0%	11.5%	11.6%	2,796.3	4,245.5
Manchester	NH	100,967	9.5%	1.4%	11.0%	$41,948	8.5%	2.5%	9.0%	10.4%	1,363.0	1,987.6
Nashua	NH	81,094	17.4%	1.8%	19.5%	$53,244	7.8%	2.7%	6.5%	7.6%	1,332.4	2,040.4
Portsmouth	NH	25,034	-1.3%	-3.4%	-4.6%	$40,212	6.7%	2.0%	6.7%	8.3%	370.0	1,178.8
Rochester	NH	27,704	23.5%	4.0%	28.5%	$40,496	9.7%	3.3%	6.3%	6.9%	348.4	467.0
Atlantic City	NJ	38,361	-5.5%	1.0%	-4.6%	$26,697	17.4%	13.7%	25.0%	29.9%	378.7	1,924.3
Bayonne	NJ	60,499	-5.5%	-1.5%	-7.0%	$42,004	7.6%	5.1%	8.8%	10.5%	901.7	431.2
Bridgeton	NJ	18,493	0.8%	-2.4%	-1.6%	$28,784	.	.	25.1%	29.5%	154.0	271.9
Camden	NJ	84,844	3.0%	-3.0%	-0.1%	$22,854	24.3%	13.5%	36.6%	44.2%	499.3	376.2
Dover Township	NJ	15,312	3.0%	1.3%	4.3%	$51,032	7.1%	4.3%	7.6%	9.5%	224.4	122.3
Jersey City	NJ	229,039	2.2%	0.2%	2.5%	$38,192	13.7%	9.3%	18.9%	21.8%	2,834.8	1,905.1
Millville	NJ	26,366	4.7%	1.4%	6.3%	$41,100	10.6%	8.0%	11.5%	13.4%	309.1	294.7
Newark	NJ	268,510	-16.4%	-2.4%	-18.4%	$28,459	16.6%	9.9%	26.3%	30.5%	2,423.6	2,052.3
Trenton	NJ	85,437	-3.7%	-3.7%	-7.3%	$33,808	13.7%	9.1%	18.1%	20.9%	880.6	433.1
Vineland	NJ	55,906	1.9%	2.1%	4.0%	$40,399	11.8%	8.9%	10.9%	12.3%	622.7	779.1
Albuquerque	NM	419,681	16.0%	9.1%	26.5%	$36,221	4.8%	4.4%	14.0%	14.9%	6,124.4	7,403.6
Las Cruces	NM	74,779	37.8%	20.4%	65.9%	$31,086	7.4%	8.4%	22.6%	25.2%	694.9	1,336.0
Santa Fe	NM	66,522	14.1%	19.1%	35.9%	$39,466	3.6%	3.3%	12.3%	11.7%	1,327.4	1,882.8
Albany	NY	103,564	-0.6%	2.5%	1.8%	$33,063	7.0%	4.3%	18.3%	18.3%	1,283.7	1,675.3
Auburn	NY	29,774	-4.0%	-4.7%	-8.5%	$29,276	10.0%	6.7%	13.8%	17.1%	268.6	539.3
Binghamton	NY	48,294	-5.1%	-8.9%	-13.5%	$27,462	9.7%	5.8%	20.0%	26.8%	446.9	646.1
Buffalo	NY	310,548	-8.3%	-5.4%	-13.2%	$24,295	12.2%	8.7%	25.6%	29.6%	2,924.4	2,616.6
Elmira	NY	32,009	-4.5%	-5.1%	-9.4%	$24,382	10.4%	6.5%	22.2%	25.4%	270.1	397.7
Glens Falls	NY	14,772	-5.5%	-1.7%	-7.1%	$35,902	.	.	11.0%	13.6%	179.8	269.8
Jamestown	NY	33,154	-3.1%	-4.4%	-7.3%	$27,055	9.2%	5.9%	18.7%	22.9%	310.3	663.0
Newburgh	NY	26,248	12.9%	-0.8%	12.0%	$29,214	13.4%	7.5%	26.2%	31.5%	214.8	256.4
New York	NY	7,380,906	3.5%	0.8%	4.4%	$39,203	11.0%	8.0%	19.3%	23.7%	118,664.3	81,611.6
Niagara Falls	NY	58,357	-13.4%	-5.6%	-18.2%	$27,133	13.0%	10.4%	18.6%	22.0%	554.6	660.3
Poughkeepsie	NY	27,808	-3.1%	-3.6%	-6.5%	$36,289	11.0%	5.7%	14.7%	23.6%	340.7	196.6
Rochester	NY	221,594	-4.2%	-4.3%	-8.3%	$29,951	8.7%	6.6%	23.5%	28.3%	2,184.6	2,200.8
Rome	NY	40,979	1.2%	-7.6%	-6.5%	$31,856	7.3%	4.5%	12.1%	13.9%	389.2	534.2
Saratoga Springs	NY	25,118	4.6%	0.5%	5.1%	$40,669	6.9%	4.2%	8.9%	10.2%	355.7	697.6
Schenectady	NY	62,893	-3.5%	-4.1%	-7.5%	$31,964	9.1%	5.9%	14.9%	17.7%	700.9	652.2

Table 3 U.S. Central Cities, Selected Economic Indicators (continued)

City	State	Population 1996	Change in Population 1980 to 1990	1990 to 1996	1980 to 1996	Median Household Income, 1989 (1998 Dollars)	Unemployment Rate 1992	1998	Poverty Rate 1989	Estimated Poverty Rate 1995	Estimated Retail Purchasing Power, 1998 ($ millions)	Estimated Retail Sales, 1998 ($ millions)
Syracuse	NY	155,865	-3.7%	-4.9%	-8.4%	$27,923	10.3%	5.6%	22.7%	26.5%	1,411.1	1,875.6
Troy	NY	52,518	-4.2%	-3.2%	-7.3%	$30,710	9.2%	5.9%	17.2%	19.8%	518.7	674.7
Utica	NY	61,368	-9.2%	-10.6%	-18.9%	$26,225	9.8%	6.1%	21.7%	27.4%	560.2	452.8
White Plains	NY	49,653	3.7%	1.9%	5.6%	$57,844	6.5%	3.5%	7.7%	10.3%	1,205.9	1,513.2
Asheville	NC	64,067	15.0%	4.0%	19.6%	$29,270	7.1%	3.5%	15.9%	17.5%	738.7	1,689.4
Burlington	NC	40,402	6.0%	2.3%	8.4%	$34,835	5.6%	3.0%	9.9%	11.1%	612.5	1,057.0
Chapel Hill	NC	44,244	19.4%	14.3%	36.5%	$40,078	3.3%	1.5%	16.1%	10.5%	648.7	601.2
Charlotte	NC	441,297	25.9%	11.5%	40.3%	$41,898	5.5%	2.5%	10.8%	12.8%	8,337.3	10,795.0
Concord	NC	32,944	61.4%	20.5%	94.5%	$33,485	6.5%	2.7%	12.1%	11.6%	463.8	696.9
Durham	NC	149,799	35.5%	9.7%	48.6%	$35,828	4.6%	2.4%	14.9%	15.2%	2,187.2	4,095.7
Fayetteville	NC	79,631	27.2%	5.2%	33.8%	$32,014	5.8%	4.1%	18.8%	20.3%	1,083.6	1,819.5
Gastonia	NC	56,575	15.6%	3.4%	19.5%	$34,059	7.6%	3.6%	14.2%	15.1%	769.2	1,166.1
Goldsboro	NC	40,801	27.7%	0.2%	28.0%	$26,231	9.1%	5.6%	21.2%	22.2%	378.7	896.5
Greensboro	NC	195,426	17.9%	6.5%	25.6%	$38,363	5.6%	2.8%	11.6%	13.5%	3,499.9	4,776.1
Greenville	NC	54,602	25.8%	21.4%	52.8%	$29,788	7.7%	5.3%	26.6%	20.4%	797.3	1,304.9
Hickory	NC	30,523	36.3%	7.9%	47.0%	$35,771	8.3%	3.7%	11.3%	14.3%	464.6	753.9
High Point	NC	74,417	9.6%	7.1%	17.4%	$32,909	6.5%	3.3%	12.7%	15.2%	1,071.5	2,006.4
Jacksonville	NC	69,889	76.0%	132.9%	309.8%	$33,780	4.7%	3.4%	11.9%	8.0%	391.1	890.4
Kannapolis	NC	35,631	-14.1%	20.0%	3.1%	$29,404	9.2%	4.0%	11.8%	12.1%	476.1	414.8
Lenoir	NC	16,373	3.2%	15.4%	19.1%	$28,094			17.6%	16.8%	160.9	336.9
Morganton	NC	14,927	9.6%	-1.0%	8.5%	$32,872			10.6%	11.6%	144.1	447.1
Raleigh	NC	243,835	38.4%	17.3%	62.3%	$42,657	4.1%	1.8%	11.8%	11.3%	4,388.3	5,732.2
Rocky Mount	NC	52,635	18.7%	7.4%	27.5%	$31,621	9.0%	7.7%	18.1%	19.1%	750.4	1,235.4
Wilmington	NC	62,192	26.2%	12.0%	41.3%	$27,091	8.9%	4.5%	22.1%	22.9%	776.9	1,818.0
Winston-Salem	NC	153,541	8.8%	7.0%	16.4%	$34,819	6.6%	3.5%	15.2%	15.2%	2,337.2	3,418.9
Bismarck	ND	53,514	10.7%	8.6%	20.3%	$37,100	4.3%	1.9%	9.7%	8.0%	742.3	1,063.3
Fargo	ND	83,778	20.7%	13.0%	36.5%	$33,291	3.5%	1.1%	13.7%	10.0%	1,341.9	2,260.3
Grand Forks	ND	50,675	12.9%	2.5%	15.8%	$33,462	3.6%	1.6%	14.5%	12.6%	603.8	1,019.2
Akron	OH	216,882	-6.0%	-2.8%	-8.6%	$29,286	9.5%	5.5%	20.5%	19.9%	2,544.6	3,320.2
Bowling Green	OH	28,307	9.5%	0.5%	10.0%	$28,612	7.6%	4.0%	27.0%	15.2%	317.3	499.7
Canton	OH	81,079	-11.2%	-3.7%	-14.4%	$26,037	12.3%	6.5%	21.9%	22.3%	801.4	1,107.3
Cincinnati	OH	345,818	-5.6%	-5.0%	-10.3%	$27,613	8.0%	4.8%	24.3%	21.9%	4,355.4	6,326.4
Cleveland	OH	498,246	-11.9%	-1.5%	-13.2%	$23,427	13.7%	8.4%	28.7%	29.9%	4,275.2	6,725.5
Columbus	OH	657,053	12.0%	3.8%	16.3%	$35,033	5.4%	2.9%	17.2%	15.6%	9,568.3	14,761.1
Dayton	OH	172,947	-10.5%	-5.0%	-15.0%	$26,000	10.9%	7.0%	26.5%	25.4%	1,575.6	1,661.4
Elyria	OH	56,729	-1.4%	0.0%	-1.4%	$35,391	9.7%	5.4%	13.7%	12.9%	629.3	788.6
Fairborn	OH	30,529	5.4%	-2.5%	2.8%	$36,225	7.5%	4.6%	15.4%	13.3%	481.0	522.5
Hamilton	OH	61,833	-2.9%	0.8%	-2.1%	$30,084	9.9%	5.1%	16.8%	14.1%	666.2	682.5
Kent	OH	27,072	10.2%	-6.1%	3.5%	$28,213	8.0%	4.3%	27.5%	18.2%	243.4	567.3
Lancaster	OH	35,442	-1.3%	2.7%	1.4%	$29,485	7.8%	3.9%	14.1%	12.6%	406.7	691.8
Lima	OH	42,913	-3.9%	-5.8%	-9.4%	$27,685	12.8%	7.7%	21.6%	19.5%	338.0	550.1

Table 3 U.S. Central Cities, Selected Economic Indicators (continued)

City	State	Population 1996	Change in Population 1980 to 1990	Change in Population 1990 to 1996	Change in Population 1980 to 1996	Median Household Income, 1989 (1998 Dollars)	Unemployment Rate 1992	Unemployment Rate 1998	Poverty Rate 1989	Estimated Poverty Rate 1995	Estimated Retail Purchasing Power, 1998 ($ millions)	Estimated Retail Sales, 1998 ($ millions)
Lorain	OH	69,800	-5.5%	-2.0%	-7.4%	$31,710	12.9%	7.4%	19.8%	19.1%	692.1	405.8
Mansfield	OH	50,906	-6.1%	0.6%	-5.6%	$29,696	11.4%	7.5%	17.8%	17.6%	597.4	766.1
Marietta	OH	15,092	-8.8%	0.4%	-8.4%	$27,539	.	.	17.7%	15.2%	179.1	407.5
Massillon	OH	30,671	1.5%	-1.1%	0.4%	$31,310	9.8%	5.1%	14.4%	14.3%	269.6	267.1
Middletown	OH	48,023	5.3%	4.3%	9.8%	$33,801	9.8%	5.0%	15.4%	12.5%	619.8	540.1
Newark	OH	48,856	7.7%	10.1%	18.6%	$30,315	8.0%	5.0%	15.6%	14.0%	594.8	599.9
Springfield	OH	67,460	-2.9%	-4.3%	-7.0%	$28,140	9.5%	5.3%	20.9%	19.1%	682.3	1,004.5
Steubenville	OH	20,966	-16.2%	-5.2%	-20.6%	$23,176	.	.	24.3%	21.2%	207.8	443.3
Toledo	OH	317,606	-6.1%	-4.6%	-10.4%	$32,625	10.0%	6.5%	19.1%	18.4%	3,535.4	3,680.1
Warren	OH	48,347	-10.3%	-4.8%	-14.6%	$29,757	15.1%	8.9%	20.0%	20.2%	589.3	693.5
Youngstown	OH	87,405	-17.1%	-8.7%	-24.3%	$22,426	16.1%	10.6%	29.0%	29.6%	650.3	726.9
Enid	OK	45,724	-10.0%	0.9%	-9.2%	$29,900	4.0%	3.7%	14.3%	16.6%	530.9	732.6
Lawton	OK	82,582	0.6%	2.5%	3.2%	$31,811	5.6%	4.6%	15.9%	19.5%	872.8	1,503.6
Norman	OK	90,228	17.7%	12.7%	32.6%	$33,080	4.0%	3.3%	15.0%	15.7%	1,315.0	1,524.2
Oklahoma City	OK	469,852	10.3%	5.7%	16.5%	$33,837	5.6%	3.6%	15.9%	18.2%	5,888.9	9,507.1
Shawnee	OK	26,833	-1.8%	3.1%	1.2%	$24,978	6.4%	5.2%	21.2%	25.5%	234.8	323.1
Tulsa	OK	378,491	1.8%	3.0%	4.9%	$33,794	5.5%	3.2%	15.0%	18.5%	5,993.6	7,268.6
Ashland	OR	17,678	8.6%	8.9%	18.3%	$30,995	.	.	17.4%	19.2%	250.7	273.2
Eugene	OR	123,718	6.7%	9.8%	17.1%	$33,348	6.8%	4.7%	17.0%	17.0%	1,865.4	2,864.8
Medford	OR	56,067	18.6%	19.4%	41.6%	$33,753	8.1%	6.2%	14.4%	15.5%	813.2	1,311.3
Portland	OR	480,824	19.4%	9.9%	31.2%	$33,641	7.7%	4.8%	14.5%	14.5%	7,559.3	8,931.4
Salem	OR	122,566	20.8%	13.7%	37.4%	$33,173	7.2%	5.5%	14.5%	14.7%	1,538.5	2,053.9
Springfield	OR	49,430	7.4%	10.6%	18.8%	$28,830	8.4%	5.9%	16.5%	16.9%	565.1	733.2
Allentown	PA	102,211	1.3%	-2.7%	-1.5%	$34,155	8.6%	5.5%	12.9%	15.2%	1,243.8	1,329.7
Altoona	PA	50,101	-9.1%	-3.4%	-12.2%	$27,204	10.7%	5.9%	18.0%	19.2%	518.4	737.5
Bethlehem	PA	70,245	1.4%	-1.7%	-0.2%	$37,299	7.8%	4.9%	13.0%	13.3%	880.0	660.6
Carlisle	PA	18,039	0.6%	-2.1%	-1.5%	$34,376	.	.	9.9%	9.5%	219.2	389.6
Erie	PA	105,270	-8.7%	-3.2%	-11.6%	$28,961	9.7%	7.0%	19.3%	20.4%	1,036.8	1,002.6
Harrisburg	PA	50,886	-1.7%	-2.8%	-4.5%	$26,723	8.1%	4.5%	27.0%	28.2%	517.6	712.8
Johnstown	PA	26,149	-20.7%	-7.1%	-26.3%	$19,506	12.5%	8.5%	26.9%	27.4%	193.3	287.8
Lancaster	PA	53,597	1.5%	-3.5%	-2.1%	$29,195	9.1%	4.8%	20.9%	22.0%	477.3	386.0
Lebanon	PA	23,791	-3.5%	-4.1%	-7.5%	$28,419	7.6%	4.8%	14.6%	16.9%	259.2	264.0
Philadelphia	PA	1,478,002	-6.1%	-6.8%	-12.5%	$32,341	8.9%	6.0%	20.3%	23.8%	15,838.4	15,548.6
Pittsburgh	PA	350,363	-12.8%	-5.3%	-17.4%	$27,272	6.8%	4.5%	21.4%	20.2%	4,237.8	4,504.1
Reading	PA	75,723	-0.4%	-3.4%	-3.8%	$29,067	10.1%	6.2%	19.4%	22.7%	743.4	815.9
Scranton	PA	77,189	-7.2%	-5.6%	-12.4%	$27,684	8.9%	5.6%	15.2%	15.9%	754.0	1,168.7
Sharon	PA	16,766	-8.2%	-4.2%	-12.0%	$27,225	.	.	18.8%	21.3%	158.5	189.4
State College	PA	39,400	7.7%	1.2%	9.1%	$23,999	2.2%	1.0%	45.4%	21.8%	301.0	393.2
Wilkes-Barre	PA	44,407	-7.8%	-6.6%	-13.9%	$25,666	9.9%	6.9%	15.4%	15.1%	410.4	455.8
Williamsport	PA	30,537	-4.4%	-4.4%	-8.6%	$26,672	9.3%	6.8%	21.1%	23.0%	260.5	653.1
York	PA	40,779	-5.4%	-3.3%	-8.6%	$28,672	9.3%	5.8%	20.3%	23.1%	359.5	550.7

Table 3 U.S. Central Cities, Selected Economic Indicators (continued)

City	State	Population 1996	Change in Population 1980 to 1990	1990 to 1996	1980 to 1996	Median Household income, 1989 (1998 Dollars)	Unemployment Rate 1992	1998	Poverty Rate 1989	Estimated Poverty Rate 1995	Estimated Retail Purchasing Power, 1998 ($ millions)	Estimated Retail Sales, 1998 ($ millions)
Pawtucket	RI	69,068	2.0%	-4.9%	-3.0%	$34,889	10.0%	5.8%	10.6%	13.8%	772.0	623.3
Providence	RI	152,558	2.5%	-5.1%	-2.7%	$29,113	9.9%	6.0%	23.0%	27.9%	1,491.6	1,559.2
Warwick	RI	84,514	-1.9%	-1.1%	-3.0%	$47,041	8.9%	4.2%	4.8%	6.2%	1,235.7	2,150.5
Woonsocket	RI	41,817	-4.4%	-4.7%	-8.9%	$33,340	10.9%	5.5%	13.9%	17.9%	437.7	705.6
Aiken	SC	22,834	32.7%	14.9%	52.5%	$43,738	.	.	15.7%	13.9%	276.5	529.4
Anderson	SC	26,429	-4.1%	0.9%	-3.2%	$25,545	8.0%	4.0%	19.9%	18.9%	324.9	1,082.3
Charleston	SC	71,052	15.7%	-11.6%	2.2%	$33,064	5.8%	2.8%	21.6%	24.5%	1,075.6	1,514.8
Columbia	SC	112,773	-3.1%	15.0%	11.4%	$30,518	6.7%	2.9%	21.2%	18.6%	1,188.7	1,506.6
Florence	SC	30,168	-0.8%	1.2%	0.4%	$32,739	8.0%	4.8%	21.8%	22.9%	435.5	893.6
Greenville	SC	57,064	0.1%	-2.1%	-2.0%	$31,500	6.3%	2.3%	17.7%	18.7%	840.7	1,886.3
Myrtle Beach	SC	25,456	34.7%	2.4%	38.0%	$32,691	8.0%	3.6%	11.7%	12.1%	442.9	1,305.7
North Charleston	SC	59,923	12.3%	-14.7%	-4.2%	$28,688	7.5%	3.7%	21.7%	23.9%	776.4	2,041.8
Rock Hill	SC	44,061	17.8%	5.8%	24.7%	$34,986	8.1%	4.6%	16.4%	17.5%	516.5	838.5
Spartanburg	SC	42,136	-1.1%	-3.1%	-4.2%	$29,475	6.6%	4.1%	21.8%	24.6%	592.2	1,139.1
Sumter	SC	38,565	68.5%	-8.1%	54.9%	$27,895	8.2%	4.5%	20.7%	21.4%	391.0	851.3
Rapid City	SD	57,642	17.3%	5.7%	24.0%	$33,836	3.1%	2.4%	13.6%	14.5%	830.8	1,240.8
Sioux Falls	SD	113,223	23.9%	12.3%	39.2%	$35,868	2.5%	1.6%	8.5%	8.6%	1,737.0	2,787.4
Bristol	TN	23,275	-2.4%	-0.6%	-3.0%	$29,787	.	.	12.7%	13.0%	312.7	341.8
Chattanooga	TN	150,425	-10.1%	-1.3%	-11.3%	$29,178	6.7%	4.4%	18.2%	19.7%	2,060.0	4,301.4
Clarksville	TN	94,879	37.8%	25.7%	73.2%	$33,311	6.9%	3.9%	13.3%	11.5%	1,222.5	1,433.4
Jackson	TN	50,406	-0.4%	3.0%	2.6%	$27,688	6.9%	3.9%	21.0%	20.3%	746.0	1,406.8
Johnson City	TN	55,542	24.2%	12.5%	39.7%	$30,304	5.7%	3.6%	17.3%	14.4%	753.8	1,294.6
Kingsport	TN	41,335	13.5%	13.7%	29.1%	$29,905	5.4%	4.0%	18.1%	16.4%	434.6	1,000.9
Knoxville	TN	167,535	-5.7%	1.5%	-4.3%	$26,189	5.8%	4.1%	20.8%	19.6%	2,043.9	4,106.4
Memphis	TN	596,725	-5.6%	-2.2%	-7.7%	$29,805	7.0%	4.6%	23.0%	24.8%	7,033.7	10,075.3
Murfreesboro	TN	53,966	36.8%	20.1%	64.3%	$34,695	6.1%	3.9%	16.0%	12.5%	731.2	1,078.7
Nashville-Davidsor	TN	511,263	7.2%	4.7%	12.2%	$36,571	4.9%	2.6%	13.4%	14.2%	8,649.5	11,309.8
Oak Ridge	TN	27,742	-1.3%	1.6%	0.3%	$42,873	4.3%	2.8%	9.5%	8.8%	479.0	832.3
Abilene	TX	108,476	8.5%	1.7%	10.3%	$32,501	5.8%	3.7%	15.3%	16.9%	1,227.1	1,769.2
Amarillo	TX	169,588	5.6%	7.6%	13.6%	$32,751	5.1%	3.8%	16.8%	16.3%	2,102.6	3,034.8
Arlington	TX	294,816	63.5%	12.6%	84.1%	$46,071	6.3%	2.9%	8.2%	9.1%	5,052.2	5,683.4
Austin	TX	541,278	34.8%	16.2%	56.7%	$33,407	4.8%	2.9%	17.9%	14.6%	8,597.7	11,488.2
Baytown	TX	68,156	12.2%	6.7%	19.7%	$39,634	8.4%	4.9%	16.1%	20.2%	944.0	754.0
Beaumont	TX	111,224	-3.2%	-2.7%	-5.8%	$32,199	8.6%	6.5%	21.1%	22.4%	1,275.0	2,264.9
Brownsville	TX	132,091	16.4%	33.5%	55.4%	$20,888	16.8%	14.4%	43.9%	39.9%	784.8	1,435.4
Bryan	TX	58,247	24.1%	5.9%	31.4%	$29,678	3.0%	1.8%	22.0%	17.6%	581.2	675.5
College Station	TX	58,757	40.7%	12.0%	57.6%	$19,036	3.1%	1.8%	38.0%	23.5%	460.6	720.3
Conroe	TX	33,748	53.1%	22.2%	87.1%	$31,067	6.8%	3.7%	18.8%	18.9%	379.7	1,189.5
Corpus Christi	TX	280,260	11.0%	8.9%	20.8%	$33,879	9.6%	6.7%	20.0%	21.8%	3,240.6	4,066.0
Dallas	TX	1,053,292	11.4%	4.6%	16.5%	$36,135	8.7%	4.2%	18.0%	19.8%	18,246.7	24,035.8
Denison	TX	22,136	-10.0%	2.9%	-7.3%	$28,852	.	.	15.4%	16.8%	224.4	312.6

Table 3 U.S. Central Cities, Selected Economic Indicators (continued)

City	State	Population 1996	Change in Population 1980 to 1990	1990 to 1996	1980 to 1996	Median Household Income, 1989 (1998 Dollars)	Unemployment Rate 1992	1998	Poverty Rate 1989	Estimated Poverty Rate 1995	Estimated Retail Purchasing Power, 1998 ($ millions)	Estimated Retail Sales, 1998 ($ millions)
Denton	TX	73,483	37.9%	10.9%	52.9%	$30,439	7.4%	3.0%	20.7%	17.6%	930.3	1,296.1
Edinburg	TX	37,742	24.1%	26.3%	56.8%	$24,918	20.1%	15.6%	33.8%	33.6%	292.0	362.6
El Paso	TX	599,865	21.2%	16.4%	41.1%	$30,839	11.2%	9.6%	25.3%	29.3%	5,244.1	6,621.0
Fort Worth	TX	479,716	16.2%	7.2%	24.5%	$34,896	9.4%	4.4%	17.4%	19.9%	6,257.8	9,180.7
Galveston	TX	60,048	-4.6%	1.7%	-3.0%	$27,375	11.5%	8.5%	24.2%	24.8%	684.5	865.5
Harlingen	TX	56,893	11.9%	16.7%	30.7%	$27,418	10.7%	9.1%	29.9%	30.6%	522.5	856.8
Houston	TX	1,744,058	2.2%	7.0%	9.3%	$34,521	8.7%	5.0%	20.7%	26.0%	27,051.2	33,195.9
Irving	TX	176,993	41.0%	14.2%	61.0%	$41,758	6.2%	3.0%	10.5%	11.1%	3,343.1	5,074.3
Killeen	TX	78,022	37.2%	22.8%	68.5%	$29,535	11.1%	6.9%	14.5%	14.0%	819.6	1,038.3
Laredo	TX	164,899	34.4%	34.2%	80.3%	$24,181	10.7%	9.2%	37.3%	35.2%	1,292.0	1,880.3
Longview	TX	74,572	12.0%	6.1%	18.8%	$33,358	10.5%	7.2%	17.0%	16.3%	968.5	1,679.0
Lubbock	TX	193,565	7.0%	4.0%	11.3%	$31,719	5.8%	3.3%	19.6%	20.2%	2,417.9	3,426.1
McAllen	TX	103,352	26.8%	23.0%	55.9%	$29,009	16.5%	12.7%	32.7%	34.4%	929.7	2,232.2
Marshall	TX	24,147	-5.0%	2.0%	-3.1%	$25,077			25.5%	23.7%	239.8	472.8
Midland	TX	97,162	26.8%	8.6%	37.8%	$41,465	7.1%	4.2%	14.4%	15.3%	1,632.2	1,609.2
Mission	TX	37,777	26.8%	31.8%	67.2%	$22,990	19.3%	15.0%	37.3%	37.5%	297.8	301.5
New Braunfels	TX	33,906	22.0%	24.0%	51.4%	$34,715	5.3%	2.7%	14.9%	12.4%	402.7	665.5
Odessa	TX	90,883	-0.4%	1.3%	1.0%	$32,003	9.6%	6.4%	19.4%	20.8%	925.9	1,507.4
Port Arthur	TX	57,701	-4.1%	-1.7%	-5.8%	$24,382	13.9%	10.8%	28.1%	30.1%	479.8	763.9
San Angelo	TX	88,098	15.3%	4.3%	20.3%	$30,936	5.5%	4.4%	18.5%	18.2%	941.0	1,439.1
San Antonio	TX	1,067,816	19.1%	14.1%	35.9%	$31,002	7.0%	4.1%	22.6%	21.6%	12,138.5	15,380.5
San Benito	TX	23,047	11.9%	14.5%	28.1%	$21,759			36.8%	39.0%	160.4	181.4
San Marcos	TX	34,994	22.7%	21.7%	49.4%	$19,476	5.6%	4.1%	37.1%	23.4%	457.5	857.3
Sherman	TX	33,155	3.9%	4.9%	9.0%	$32,551	8.8%	5.3%	15.6%	16.2%	407.8	964.7
Temple	TX	51,394	8.5%	11.5%	21.0%	$30,489	5.2%	3.1%	19.2%	19.4%	686.3	1,108.8
Texarkana	TX	32,462	1.2%	2.5%	3.8%	$28,584	11.1%	9.4%	21.8%	21.5%	352.0	908.9
Texas City	TX	42,368	-1.4%	3.8%	2.3%	$34,367	10.4%	7.7%	16.8%	17.3%	440.0	641.6
Tyler	TX	82,185	7.0%	8.9%	16.6%	$31,103	8.3%	6.0%	19.5%	18.5%	1,030.6	2,011.3
Victoria	TX	61,059	8.6%	10.9%	20.4%	$33,620	6.4%	4.8%	18.9%	18.4%	821.2	1,197.6
Waco	TX	108,412	2.3%	4.7%	7.1%	$23,467	8.7%	5.5%	28.7%	27.3%	1,057.8	1,791.5
Wichita Falls	TX	100,138	2.2%	4.0%	6.3%	$30,970	6.8%	4.9%	16.6%	16.7%	1,139.5	1,519.5
Clearfield	UT	22,153	19.2%	3.3%	23.2%	$35,328			17.5%	17.4%	293.5	224.6
Ogden	UT	65,720	-0.8%	2.8%	2.0%	$30,874	8.8%	5.9%	16.8%	18.1%	741.7	1,142.2
Orem	UT	79,736	28.9%	18.0%	52.2%	$41,094	3.6%	2.2%	9.0%	6.6%	985.8	1,360.8
Provo	UT	99,606	17.2%	14.7%	34.4%	$27,818	4.8%	3.0%	29.6%	20.3%	1,016.5	1,565.0
Salt Lake City	UT	172,575	-1.9%	7.9%	5.9%	$29,836	5.3%	3.3%	16.4%	15.2%	2,763.7	5,714.7
Burlington	VT	39,004	3.8%	-0.3%	3.4%	$33,550	5.2%	2.8%	19.3%	17.6%	477.1	560.6
Arlington	VA	175,334	12.0%	2.6%	14.9%	$58,627	4.5%	1.7%	7.1%	7.6%	4,526.4	2,877.4
Bristol	VA	17,957	-3.2%	-2.5%	-5.7%	$25,273	7.9%	4.4%	20.6%	19.5%	175.7	419.7
Charlottesville	VA	40,767	1.1%	1.1%	2.1%	$31,798	4.9%	1.6%	23.7%	21.5%	510.4	723.7
Danville	VA	53,472	16.2%	0.8%	17.2%	$26,833	11.3%	6.1%	19.0%	21.0%	508.8	1,369.2

Table 3 U.S. Central Cities, Selected Economic Indicators (continued)

City	State	Population 1996	Change in Population 1980 to 1990	Change in Population 1990 to 1996	Change in Population 1980 to 1996	Median Household Income, 1989 (1998 Dollars)	Unemployment Rate 1992	Unemployment Rate 1998	Poverty Rate 1989	Estimated Poverty Rate 1995	Estimated Retail Purchasing Power, 1998 ($ millions)	Estimated Retail Sales, 1998 ($ millions)
Fredericksburg	VA	22,586	24.2%	18.7%	47.4%	$34,985	9.1%	3.1%	12.3%	15.7%	258.3	566.1
Hampton	VA	138,757	9.1%	3.7%	13.2%	$39,625	7.2%	3.9%	10.8%	13.8%	1,537.9	1,703.1
Lynchburg	VA	67,250	-1.0%	1.8%	0.8%	$31,188	6.7%	2.7%	16.4%	19.3%	764.8	1,605.8
Newport News	VA	176,122	17.4%	3.6%	21.5%	$36,108	7.0%	4.3%	14.0%	15.8%	1,962.1	2,319.2
Norfolk	VA	233,430	-2.2%	-10.6%	-12.6%	$30,974	7.4%	5.4%	19.3%	24.2%	2,288.1	3,563.8
Petersburg	VA	38,234	-6.5%	-0.4%	-6.9%	$28,011	12.2%	5.5%	20.3%	25.7%	362.1	533.7
Portsmouth	VA	101,308	-0.6%	-2.5%	-3.1%	$32,338	8.6%	5.6%	17.7%	21.0%	905.5	998.0
Richmond	VA	198,267	-7.4%	-2.4%	-9.6%	$30,958	9.3%	3.9%	20.9%	25.3%	2,549.2	2,601.7
Roanoke	VA	95,548	-3.8%	-0.9%	-4.7%	$29,696	7.2%	3.1%	16.1%	20.0%	1,146.2	2,468.6
Suffolk	VA	58,901	9.5%	13.0%	23.7%	$34,342	7.9%	4.3%	17.3%	16.1%	698.9	579.3
Virginia Beach	VA	430,385	49.9%	9.5%	64.1%	$47,679	5.3%	2.9%	5.9%	8.8%	6,020.9	6,404.4
Bellevue	WA	92,267	17.6%	6.2%	24.8%	$57,576	4.7%	2.1%	5.6%	6.2%	2,838.6	3,811.9
Bellingham	WA	61,043	13.9%	17.0%	33.3%	$32,487	7.5%	5.4%	16.7%	15.4%	934.8	1,192.0
Bremerton	WA	41,580	5.3%	9.0%	14.8%	$29,721	9.4%	7.9%	18.1%	17.5%	327.6	324.2
Everett	WA	81,028	28.6%	15.8%	48.9%	$37,352	10.6%	4.9%	12.0%	14.3%	1,000.7	1,444.2
Kennewick	WA	51,184	22.6%	21.4%	48.8%	$37,150	8.5%	7.4%	13.9%	10.8%	685.2	762.7
Olympia	WA	39,006	23.3%	15.3%	42.1%	$36,524	6.5%	4.7%	13.0%	12.6%	547.1	1,043.8
Pasco	WA	23,910	13.3%	17.6%	33.2%	$23,526			33.0%	27.3%	168.4	341.6
Richland	WA	37,445	-3.8%	15.9%	11.5%	$48,145	6.1%	5.4%	7.8%	6.2%	773.1	616.2
Seattle	WA	524,704	4.5%	1.6%	6.2%	$38,585	7.5%	3.5%	12.4%	13.8%	11,001.0	10,752.6
Spokane	WA	186,562	3.4%	5.3%	8.9%	$29,172	7.7%	5.3%	17.3%	16.3%	2,278.1	3,346.0
Tacoma	WA	179,114	11.5%	1.4%	13.0%	$33,301	8.6%	5.0%	16.8%	19.2%	2,210.1	3,029.0
Vancouver	WA	59,982	8.3%	29.3%	40.0%	$28,330	9.0%	5.2%	17.1%	16.2%	603.2	476.1
Yakima	WA	65,110	10.0%	18.8%	30.7%	$29,168	13.7%	10.2%	20.2%	19.1%	824.9	1,062.5
Charleston	WV	56,098	-10.4%	-2.1%	-12.3%	$31,002	9.2%	4.8%	18.8%	20.9%	976.1	1,255.3
Huntington	WV	53,941	-13.9%	-1.6%	-15.3%	$24,024	11.9%	6.2%	23.2%	23.4%	626.4	797.6
Parkersburg	WV	32,766	-15.3%	-3.2%	-18.0%	$26,896	11.7%	7.5%	19.0%	22.7%	378.5	886.0
Weirton	WV	21,731	-10.6%	-1.8%	-12.1%	$37,150			9.5%	11.0%	268.3	316.0
Wheeling	WV	33,311	-19.0%	-4.5%	-22.7%	$27,675	8.2%	4.1%	16.9%	17.8%	420.4	671.4
Appleton	WI	65,862	11.3%	0.3%	11.6%	$43,387	4.2%	3.0%	6.8%	5.7%	1,086.3	935.6
Beloit	WI	35,836	1.0%	0.7%	1.8%	$33,992	11.8%	5.2%	17.5%	15.8%	441.0	459.2
Eau Claire	WI	58,872	10.4%	3.5%	14.3%	$32,515	6.8%	3.2%	18.6%	13.0%	790.9	1,415.5
Green Bay	WI	102,076	9.7%	5.8%	16.1%	$35,190	6.0%	3.8%	13.4%	10.2%	1,368.2	1,692.3
Janesville	WI	58,960	2.1%	13.1%	15.4%	$41,516	7.5%	4.8%	8.3%	7.1%	899.0	956.6
Kenosha	WI	86,888	3.4%	8.1%	11.8%	$36,504	8.0%	4.3%	12.7%	10.9%	1,035.4	979.1
La Crosse	WI	50,212	5.5%	-1.6%	3.9%	$28,850	5.4%	3.4%	21.0%	15.5%	547.4	1,511.3
Madison	WI	197,630	12.1%	3.3%	15.8%	$38,673	2.2%	1.6%	16.1%	10.5%	3,647.4	4,709.8
Milwaukee	WI	590,503	-1.3%	-6.0%	-7.2%	$31,058	6.2%	4.8%	22.2%	22.9%	6,208.4	7,130.2
Neenah	WI	23,936	3.5%	3.1%	6.7%	$42,439			6.0%	4.6%	370.4	387.2
Oshkosh	WI	57,957	10.9%	5.4%	16.8%	$33,084	4.5%	3.2%	12.6%	8.7%	799.4	978.0
Racine	WI	82,572	-1.7%	-2.0%	-3.7%	$34,887	10.9%	6.2%	15.9%	14.0%	907.7	965.9

Table 3 U.S. Central Cities, Selected Economic Indicators (continued)

City	State	Population 1996	Change in Population 1980 to 1990	Change in Population 1990 to 1996	Change in Population 1980 to 1996	Median Household Income, 1989 (1998 Dollars)	Unemployment Rate 1992	Unemployment Rate 1998	Poverty Rate 1989	Estimated Poverty Rate 1995	Estimated Retail Purchasing Power, 1998 ($ millions)	Estimated Retail Sales, 1998 ($ millions)
Sheboygan	WI	49,987	3.3%	0.6%	4.0%	$36,342	4.8%	2.6%	9.3%	8.2%	660.1	859.2
Superior	WI	27,396	-8.2%	1.0%	-7.4%	$27,480	7.6%	4.5%	17.1%	14.3%	295.2	457.5
Waukesha	WI	60,197	13.2%	5.7%	19.6%	$47,575	5.2%	3.1%	6.1%	5.9%	1,050.9	1,583.8
Wausau	WI	36,809	14.3%	-0.7%	13.5%	$33,527	5.8%	3.8%	11.7%	11.3%	462.7	621.3
Casper	WY	48,800	-8.4%	4.4%	-4.3%	$36,409	6.9%	4.6%	11.4%	12.5%	714.7	929.3
Cheyenne	WY	53,729	5.8%	7.4%	13.6%	$36,960	4.2%	3.3%	10.3%	10.3%	789.6	1,052.5

SOURCES: 1980 and 1990 Decennial Census, Bureau of the Census; Local Area Unemployment Statistics, Bureau of Labor Statistics; Tract Level Retail Sales and Income Estimates Provided by Claritas, Inc.

NOTE: Retail Sales and Purchasing Power are the sum of these data for census tracts either wholly or predominantly inside these cities.

ENDNOTES

1 These estimates are based on 1998 data provided by Claritas, Inc., a leading private market research firm (see technical note in Appendix).

2 The Boston Consulting Group and The Initiative for a Competitive Inner City, "The Business Case for Pursuing Retail Opportunities in the Inner City," Boston, Massachusetts, June 1998.

3 Jeffrey Humphreys, "African-American Buying Power by Place of Residence: 1990–1999," *Georgia Business and Economic Conditions* July–August 1998, "Hispanic Buying Power by Place of Residence," *Georgia Business and Economic Conditions* November–December 1998, and "Total Buying Power by Place of Residence," *Georgia Business and Economic Conditions* March–April 1998.

4 "The Business of Neighborhood Markets: A Project of the Social Compact," Shorebank Corporation, Chicago, Illinois, May 1997. And Robert Weissbourd and Christopher Berry, "The Market Potential of Inner City Neighborhoods: Filling the Information Gap," Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy, The Brookings Institution, Washington, DC, March 1999.

5 Christy Fisher, "City Lights Beckon to Business," *American Demographics* (October 1997), p.46.

6 Michael A. Fletcher, "More Retailers are Sold on Cities," *The Washington Post,* March 5, 1999, E1.

7 Op. Cit., "The Business Case for Pursuing Retail Opportunities in the Inner City."

8 Op. Cit., "More Retailers are Sold on Cities."

9 Op. Cit., "The Business Case for Pursuing Retail Opportunities in the Inner City," p.1

10 Some researchers estimate that the unrecorded economy amounts to about 17 percent of the Nation's GDP—or $1 trillion. See M. Leanne Lachman, "Hidden Income=Hidden Potential," *International Council of Shopping Centers—Research Quarterly* 2(2).

11 Jeffrey Humphreys, "African-American Buying Power by Place of Residence: 1990–1999," *Georgia Business and Economic Conditions* July–August 1998, "Hispanic Buying Power by Place of Residence," *Georgia Business and Economic Conditions* November–December 1998, and "Total Buying Power by Place of Residence," *Georgia Business and Economic Conditions* March–April 1998.

12 These estimates are based on 1998 data provided by Claritas, Inc., a leading private market research firm (see technical note in Appendix).

13 In Table 2, "new market areas" are defined for the purposes of this table as census tracts in which 20% or more of the population was in poverty in 1989 or in which the median family income for the tract was less than 80 percent of the median family income for the surrounding metropolitan area in 1989.

14 Op. Cit., "The Business Case for Pursuing Retail Opportunities in the Inner City," p.7.

15 Op. Cit., "City Lights Beckon..."

16 Op. Cit., "More Retailers are Sold on Cities."

17 Op. Cit., "City Lights Beckon..."

18 Ericka Blount, "Food Fight in Brooklyn," *The Wall Street Journal* (October 21, 1998), B22. Also see *Shopping Centers Today,* the newsletter of the International Council of Shopping Centers.

19 Op. Cit., "City Lights Beckon..."

20 Social Compact, "Emerging Neighborhood Markets Initiative," Chicago, Illinois, 1998.

21 Op. Cit., "Food Fight..."

22 Op. Cit., "More Retailers are Sold..."

23 See, for example, the nationally awarded Quality of Life Physical Plans for South Bronx Communities, Comprehensive Community Revitalization Program, New York, New York, 1994.

24 Op. Cit., "The Business of Neighborhood Markets: A Project of the Social Compact," and "The Market Potential of Inner City Neighborhoods: Filling the Information Gap."

25 Op. Cit., "The Market Potential of Inner City Neighborhoods," p.8.

26 Op. Cit., "The Market Potential of Inner City Neighborhoods."

27 Elliott Zwiebach, "Inner City Markets Can Perform," SN, June 24, 1996, p.12.

28 Op. Cit., "City Lights..."

29 The White House Office of Management and Budget, Notice "Revised Standards for Defining Metropolitan Areas in the 1990s," published at 55 FR 12154, March 30, 1990 (excerpt).

newmarketsuntapp00unit_0
newmarketsuntapp00unit_0
newmarketsuntapp00unit_0

ISBN 0-16-050105-9

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Policy Development and Research
Washington, DC 20410–6000

FIRST-CLASS MAIL
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
HUD
Permit No. G–795

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use $300

Return Service Requested